Class 283.0045 Book M331
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE FUTURE
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

A Volume of Essays by

THE DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER, CANON F. W. DWELLY, CANON B. K. CUNNINGHAM, LT.-COL. R. E. MARTIN, THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL, THE BISHOP OF PLYMOUTH, CANON H. N. BATE, CANON GARFIELD WILLIAMS, AND THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

Edited by

SIR JAMES MARCHANT, K.B.E.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4
NEW YORK, TORONTO
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1926

283.0045
M331
81164

YMANGA DHT MOO
YRARBLI
NIOV WEN

Made in Great Britain

DEDICATED TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND EDWARD STUART TALBOT
D.D., LL.D.

SOMETIME BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, SOUTHWARK
AND WINCHESTER

My Dear Bishop Talbot,

In your delightful volume of Early Memories you quote from one of your addresses, dated as far back as 1873—'*Keble's third year,*'—*to a small group of men who met to talk over religious and social problems raised by the Tractarian movement, words which most fittingly describe the object of this book on* '*The Future of the Church of England.*' *The ideal you sketched was of a Church and a Catholic theology utterly fixed in its great central principles and in many of their corollaries, yet ever yielding up new meanings, even from its central depths, in the light of other knowledge and human developments—such a theology, and at the same time a Church system, unchanging in one sense yet elastic enough in another, and these two together capable of laying hold upon the future, its movements, questions, temptations, advantages, discoveries : this is, you concluded, what we want.*

In positions of great influence, first at Keble and later in the sees of Rochester, Southwark and Winchester, by your loyalty to Catholic authority combined with an eager recognition of the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit, and by your wisdom and insight displayed in persistently

pressing for the application of the principles of the Faith to modern international, social and industrial conditions, you have done much to forward the realization of that noble ideal.

It has seemed appropriate to those who have been associated with me in preparing this book, about which I have from time to time consulted you, that it should be dedicated to you. In such a dedication we believe the multitude of your friends throughout the Church would heartily concur. For this book is concerned with the faith and the work of the Church in some of her manifold activities upon which, to her inestimable advantage, you have, by your learning, devotion and foresight, throughout a long life, made so deep and lasting an impression.

Believe me, with great respect,

Yours very sincerely,

James Marchant.

PREFACE

The Church of England has always been, and must always be, in living union with the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church of Christ. Her insular life is rooted in the life of the Anglo-Saxon race. Eminently a National Church she has held fast, through revolution and reformation, to her unbroken, supernatural, and supernational life in the Church Catholic. By reason of this twofold character the Church of England to-day, set in the midst of our far-flung Empire, is vibrating with missionary zeal for peoples far beyond the land of her birth. To-day, beyond comparison with any other period in her history, the gates of the world are flung wide open for her continuous expansion, and her responsibilities are correspondingly grave. And to-day also, as never before, she has the supremely unique opportunity of becoming the nucleus around which East and West, Protestant and Catholic may gather that the unity of Christendom may be ultimately realised. 'That they all may be one as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou has sent Me.'

The present position and prospects of this living, growing, and far-spreading branch cannot but be of profound concern to the whole Church. The group of writers here drawn together attempt, in their several ways, within the narrow limits necessarily imposed, to treat of various aspects of her manifold opportunities and activities at home and abroad. Each writer is alone responsible for his own contribution, but it will

be obvious to the reader that all alike are imbued with a deep anxiety for the preservation and development of her life, both for her own sake and that she may bring the best contribution of which she is capable to the 'Great Church' of the future. To this end they draw out the lessons of her past history, and survey her present position, and propose methods of improving her worship, her organisations, and of exerting her influence more and more effectively upon social, educational, industrial, and international problems and movements.

I am much indebted to several counsellors for advice and help freely rendered in the preparation of this volume, and in particular to the Bishop of Winchester, to whom, not only in this matter but in other national and literary work I owe grateful thanks. The dedication to the Right Rev. Bishop Talbot reveals other and older indebtednesses.

I write this prefatory note in the silence of the ancient and beautiful church of St. Mary the Virgin, Monken Hadley, where I often repair for quiet meditation. Here, where our forefathers sleep who lived centuries before the Reformation, the long and eventful history of the Church, of her Prayer Book, of her struggles for the Faith, of her devotional life, of her saints and prophets, passes before me like a living panorama.

And then, in spite of grievous faults and failures, which down the ages have marred her course, and still mar it, as these pages witness, the vision comes of what she might be, the living centre to attract and hold our whole religious life as a nation, through whose ministrations all might find access to God, by whose sacraments and intercession all might obtain healing, on whose bosom all the weary might rest, in whose light all might see Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

It is toward evening as I write and the sounds of day die away. The western sun is flooding this holy

place with many coloured rays, which symbolise the many varied gifts that the one united Church shall offer to her one Lord. The sevenfold radiance is at this moment focussed upon the sacred altar, the centre of our common worship, and I read :

'And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.'

J. M.

All Saints' Day, 1926.

CONTENTS

I

THE LESSONS OF FOUR HUNDRED YEARS

BY THE VERY REV. W. H. HUTTON, D.D.

I. Progress in History. The preparation for the Reformation. The Friars. The Wycliffites. Reasons for the success of the one and the failure of the other movement pp. 3–7

II. Six periods and an influence. (1) The Reformation. (2) The Caroline Age. (3) The Nonjurors. (4) The Wesleyans. (5) The Tractarians. (6) Foreign influence „ 7–19

III. A new age beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. Philanthropy, social righteousness. The foreign influences, Protestant and Catholic. The twentieth century. Ceremonial in State and Church. Gradual growth of toleration in regard to the former. Dangers of (*a*) persecution, (*b*) narrowness of outlook, (*c*) mechanism. . „ 19–25

IV. The aims of the Church, and the progress towards their realisation. The desire for freedom. Conclusion. Toleration: and the danger of drawing too sharp lines „ 25–27

II

THE FAITH OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

BY THE RT. REV. WILLIAM TEMPLE, D.D.

The personal outlook of the writer allowed for . . . pp. 31–34

I. Reaction of Christian tradition to Astronomy . „ 34–36

II. Reaction of Christian tradition to Biology and Evolution . . . . . „ 36–43

(*a*) As regards the Fall and Original Sin . . „ 36–38

(*b*) As regards the Incarnation . . . . „ 38–42

(*c*) As regards the Problem of Evil . . . „ 42–43

III. Reaction of Christian tradition to Psychology . pp. 43–46

IV. Reaction of Christian tradition to the contemporary predominance of Science . . . . . „ 46–48

III

THE FUTURE OF WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY THE REV. CANON F. W. DWELLY, M.A.

Indications of the future of worship in the Church of England. What do we mean by corporate worship and by revision? The relation of an act of worship to the worshipping life . . . . . pp. 51–53

I. The emergence of the spirit of worship. Worship and sacrifice. The Eucharist. The development of the forms of Christian worship out of the Jewish forms of worship „ 53–58

II. New forms of worship. The form of Eucharist and of Morning and Evening Prayers and Liturgical hours. The English Prayer Book. The attempt to relate modern life to the new vision of God in worship. Two objections to the new vision . . . . . „ 58–61

III. Alternative forms of worship. Four Liturgical suggestions presented to the Revisers. The problem of providing variety within the canon of the Communion office. Six questions concerning the canon . . . . . „ 61–67

IV. Concerning psalms and hymns and spiritual songs . „ 67–68

V. Unreality in worship. The anxiety of the Parochial Clergy. Psychology and worship . . . . . „ 68–70

VI. Worship and unity . . . . . p. 70

IV

THE CLERGY AND THEIR TRAINING

BY THE REV. CANON B. K. CUNNINGHAM, M.A., O.B.E.

I. The priesthood of the laity. The idea of priesthood. The call to priesthood . . . . . pp. 73–81

II. The shortage of candidates. The causes of shortage. Social and financial considerations. The intellectual requirement. The training of the graduate candidate. The non-graduate candidate. Some criticisms. Conclusion . . . . . „ 81–104

V

THE NEW CO-OPERATION

BY LT.-COLONEL R. E. MARTIN, M.A., C.M.G.

The National Assembly of the Church of England briefly described and its representative character and importance shown . . . . . pp. 107–115

I. Man-power of the Church. The shortage of clergy and what is being done to remedy it . . . . . „ 115–120

II. The Material Resources of the Church. Some aspects of Church finance considered . . . . . „ 120–127

VI

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

BY THE RT. REV. A. A. DAVID, D.D.

I. The *control* of education, originally in the hands of the Church, has gradually been acquired by the State. To the new situation, thus created, the Church must adapt itself by seeking to *inspire* rather than control. The difficulty of this adjustment is illustrated by the Elementary School controversy. . . . . pp. 131–137

II. An examination of present opinions in the Anglican and Free Churches and among teachers suggests the possibility of a new co-operation between them in the application of teaching methods, based (1) on the *educational* interest of the child, and (2) on the training of the teacher in such method, and on his own religious adherence and development . . . . . „ 137–146

III. There is also a wide field of activity open to the Church in the sphere of Adult Education, and in stimulating by this and other means a popular demand for religious influence and instruction on broad lines in the Universities and the Secondary Schools . . . . . „ 146–147

VII

THE CHURCH AND POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

BY THE RT. REV. J. H. B. MASTERMAN, D.D.

The future of political and economic problems. Change in Christian attitude . . . . . pp. 151–153

I. Resolutions of Lambeth Conference (1920). Personal salvation and social service . . . . . „ 154–156

II. The Church and politics. Social co-operation and reunion. The twofold duty of the Church . . „ 156–161

III. Influence of (1) the Catholic ideal, (2) missionary effort, (3) protection of the right of self-determination, (4) moral significance of property, on the Church's social teaching „ 161–165

IV. The ideal of the Kingdom of God, evolutionary or apocalyptic. The Christian Crusade . . . . „ 165–169

VIII

REUNION

BY THE REV. CANON HERBERT NEWELL BATE, M.A.

In regard to Reunion, a review of opportunities and tasks is less precarious than an attempt at prediction. The practical character of the present movement, arising from the peculiar activism of this age, has already weakened the particularist spirit . . . . . pp. 173–176

I. Three contrasted views of the problem (1) the Roman view, that unity already exists, and Reunion is logically impossible: (2) that of extreme Protestantism, which regards visible unity as neither possible nor desirable: (3) a liberal Catholic view, which regards unity as an essential and as yet unaccomplished task of the Church „ 176–182

II. Policies resulting from these views (1) submission to Rome: (2) 'federalism': (3) the movement towards a truly Catholic unity. 'Federalism': its practical advantages, its essential inadequacy as an ideal, and its dangers as a policy. If Reunion is the goal, the first step now is the education of the rank and file of the Church, (*a*) as to the evils of disunion and the incompleteness of our own corporate life, (*b*) as to the present world-wide reactions against those evils . . . . . „ 183–191

III. With this should go the continuation, over a wide area, of the discussions resulting from the Lambeth Appeal. Those discussions are not exhausted: the issues, *e.g.* as between 'continuity' and its opposite, have not yet been fully considered on either side. In respect to the Ministry, the problem of 'validity' is specially ripe for further consideration . . . . . pp. 191–195

IX

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN THE EMPIRE AND IN OTHER LANDS

BY THE REV. CANON F. GARFIELD WILLIAMS, O.B.E., M.B., B.S.

The Missionary tradition of the Anglican Church. The origin and growth of the Society method in the overseas work of the Church. The growth of Empire a determining factor in the expansion of the Church of England. The decadent Church life of the eighteenth century and its influence on the overseas work of the Church . pp. 199–203

I. The Evangelical revival and the new spirit of the nineteenth century. The unsympathetic attitude to missions of the official leadership of the Church in the first part of the nineteenth century and its subsequent change . „ 203–207

II. The increasing co-operation between various groups in the extension of the Kingdom and its importance for this particular age. The past achievement of the accredited Missionary Societies of the Church and their present need . . . . . „ 207–212

III. A forward look—hopes and fears . . . . „ 212–215

X

THE ASPECT AND THE PROSPECT

BY THE RIGHT REV. F. T. WOODS, D.D.

Humility and hopefulness of the Church at the present day. Elements of possible tragedy, yet of great opportunity. Contribution of the Church of England to the realisation of the Creed—'One Catholic and Apostolic Church'. pp. 219–220

I. The first note (omitted in the Creed): 'Holy.' Decline of 'otherworldliness'—yet the Church the New Human Race—with corresponding character. Otherwise Baptism meaningless, and Church life ineffective . . „ 220–223

II. The second note: 'Catholic.' Modern movements in this direction: (1) The quest for truth, and the unity of truth; (2) The desire for a larger fellowship abroad; at home, particularly in industry; (3) Growing desire for fellowship in the Church itself . . . . . pp. 224–242

III. The third note: 'Apostolic.' The Apostolic Succession in history must be complemented by an Apostolic Succession in faith and sacrifice . . . . . ,, 242–244

THE LESSONS OF FOUR HUNDRED YEARS

BY THE VERY REV. W. H. HUTTON, D.D.
(Dean of Winchester)

SYNOPSIS

I. Progress in History. The preparation for the Reformation. The Friars. The Wycliffites. Reasons for the success of the one and the failure of the other movement . . . . . pp. 3–7

II. Six periods and an influence. (1) The Reformation. (2) The Caroline Age. (3) The Nonjurors. (4) The Wesleyans. (5) The Tractarians. (6) Foreign influence „ 7–19

III. A new age beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. Philanthropy, social righteousness. The foreign influences, Protestant and Catholic. The twentieth century. Ceremonial in State and Church. Gradual growth of toleration in regard to the former. Dangers of (*a*) persecution, (*b*) narrowness of outlook, (*c*) mechanism . . . . . „ 19–25

IV. The aims of the Church, and the progress towards their realisation. The desire for freedom. Conclusion. Toleration; and the danger of drawing too sharp lines „ 25–27

I

THE LESSONS OF FOUR HUNDRED YEARS

I

THOUGH history does not repeat itself he would be foolish who would deny that in the life of man on the earth, as in the processes of physical nature, similar causes produce similar, though not identical, results; or that experience garnered by past generations may be, and should be more often than it is, of value to their successors. But it is with nations as it is with individuals. Nothing is so difficult as to induce a boy or girl to believe and profit by the advice, often very dearly bought, of older persons : except the difficulty of inducing leaders in the State, and very specially leaders in the Church, to learn from the successes, or the misadventures, of those who have gone before them. Perhaps this is not wholly to be regretted. It is by originality of action, based upon freshness of thought, that the progress of mankind is secured. Old things are continually passing away, old thoughts and needs becoming new ; and they require new treatment, founded upon fresh vision and new inspiration.

In the entirely Christian view of history it is impossible to deny progress. To mock at progress seems very nearly to be mocking at God. But the Spirit breatheth where He listeth, and though we hear the sweep of His wings it is rarely indeed that we can tell whence they come or whither they go. Thus in no part of human life is hasty generalisation more dangerous than in that which concerns the conduct of Church progress in relation to the world issues of the

changing years. Though it is true indeed that those who understand the history of the Church will find in it a cordial for drooping spirits, he who lives wholly in its past will be very unfit to guide its future. The most prolonged study of the Church's past, and the most eager concern in her present, with the endeavour to view both as they are seen in the eternal thought of God, can only lead to the old conclusion :

'Of old hast Thou laid the foundation of the Earth : and the Heavens are the work of Thy hands.

They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure : yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment ; as a vesture shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed :

But Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end.

The children of Thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before Thee.'

'The children of Thy servants shall continue.' We cannot ignore the links that bind us to the past of our race and of our Church.

Revolution is contrary to our whole knowledge of the working of God. 'True progress,' said Leopold von Ranke, 'includes the past.' Thus it is well that those who most ardently desire to understand the problems of the day, and to mould the future according to the will of God, should look backward and learn from the past what are the lessons which God has written in the history of mankind.

It is impossible in history to draw a line of division. When did modern history begin? Edward Augustus Freeman used to ask. At the call of Abraham, or at the French Revolution? If we wish to profit by the lessons of the history of the English Church and people we cannot begin at the reign of Henry VIII or at that of Elizabeth. The startling crises of those days had long been a-preparing, and the men who were engaged in them were the true children of their English progenitors.

Let us look then, for a moment, beyond the limit which editorial wisdom has fixed for the subject of this essay. Henry VII and the primates of his time had begun to dissolve monasteries and use their revenues for other purposes than those of their foundation, before Henry VIII, or Cromwell, the 'malleus monachorum,' ever thought of doing so.

English bishops as well as English Parliaments had long protested against Papal interference and endeavoured to prevent it, and many an English churchman and statesman had declared that cardinals were corrupt and popes pretentious. The water which flowed under the bridge had continually risen till it became a flood and swept the bridge away.

All through the Middle Ages Englishmen had grumbled about the financial exactions of Rome, and not infrequently those in authority at home had murmured against orders from abroad, sometimes to the point of refusing to obey them. The English Reformation was not a sudden or unexpected convulsion. We may leave for the moment the lessons which may be derived from it, and look at two earlier movements which have something to teach us : those of the friars and the Wycliffites.

The resemblances between the work of the Mendicant orders in England and that of John Wesley and George Whitefield are numerous and remarkable. Of the earlier it may be observed in this connexion that it was bitterly resented by the established interests of the great monastic houses and the parochial clergy.[1] When one reads the letters of Grosseteste one might often imagine one's self studying the correspondence of an eighteenth-century bishop. The outrageous novelty of the methods of these hot-headed men who are turning the world upside down : their intolerable interference with the working of the parochial system :

[1] See *Memorials of St. Edm. Abbey*, ii, 272, 6. The people declared that the monks hated the friars as the Jews did the Samaritans.

their unauthorised dealing with individual souls : their contradiction of established order : their low manner of living : their much worse than undignified style of preaching : their encouragement of social disorder : their enthusiasm : their vulgarity ! And yet by their sheer love of God and of His people the friars won the day and put a new heart into English religion and a new ideal into English life. Contrast Wycliffe and his followers. He had an even keener sense of the abuses of his time than had St. Francis. His followers had an even deeper sense than the friars of the shame and danger of the social conditions of their day. But the Wycliffite movement almost entirely failed, faded, and left scarce a mark behind. Why ? Partly no doubt because of the crabbed scholasticism of Wycliffe's theology, perhaps the most unedifying and ineffective that the whole of the Middle Ages produced;[1] even more certainly because of his own alliance with corrupt and self-seeking politicians, and of his followers' associations with political and social theories outside the orbit of religious life.

Regret it or not, it cannot be denied that while Englishmen accepted the teaching of St. Francis and his poor men, they decisively rejected that of Wycliffe and his revolutionary following. Lessons hence survive up to and beyond the age of the Reformation.

To say this is to remind ourselves that the history of religion in England does not begin with the

[1] I do not dream of denying that many good and true things were said by John Wycliffe, as there must be by every man who tries to serve God in his own way. The Wycliffe Society has rendered great service to our knowledge of mediaeval history and theology by its publication of many volumes of his writings ; but surely no one who has spent serious hours in the study of them can fail to see how utterly flat, stale and unprofitable for the most part they are. His theology seems to me to be essentially illiberal and perverse, and his followers, of course with notable exceptions, to have been not Reformers before the Reformation, but in some cases Communists before the age of political Communism, and in others lunatics before the age of asylums.

Reformation, nor can the lessons we are to learn from it be made to begin with Henry VIII and Cranmer. On the other hand, it is not to be pretended, as a somewhat partisan reaction a few years ago seemed to suggest, that the English Church was Protestant before the Reformation and Catholic afterwards. All that is to be desired, when we are looking for the lessons of the past in this regard, is that we should see history clearly and see it whole, that we should draw no arbitrary lines, in theology or chronology, and that we should be prepared to learn our lessons wheresoever and from whomsoever they are to be obtained.

II

From the sixteenth century the history of the Church in England is so obviously continuous and so full, that we must be content, in dealing with our subject, not to epitomise but to select. It may be well to confine ourselves to considering (1) What did the Reformation really do ; or, in other words, how is its quite obvious success to be accounted for ; (2) What is the meaning of the religious contest of Caroline times ; (3) What is to be learnt from the history of the Nonjurors ; (4) What from Wesley and his followers ; (5) What from the Oxford, and more recent, movements and men? To these, perhaps, may be added (6) influences from Continental Europe, which are not so negligible as we often imagine.

(1) Under the first head too much prominence has often been attached to the last. The Reformation caused a breach with a great part of Europe. If the contest between the Roman Curia and Henry VIII was often not very much more than a rather unfriendly bickering—for it is quite clear that the quarrel might really have been made up at almost any moment, since Catholic sovereigns have claimed allowedly quite as much against Popes as the English have claimed ;

and the Popes had freely condemned such marriages as in the case of Henry VIII they allowed ; and the reign of Mary showed how easy it was for England and Rome to reunite—yet there was a deep underlying feeling, which had long been maturing, which now became the operative cause of a fact irrevocable in English history. It may very well be that the great dividing point was reached when the Pope declared Queen Elizabeth excommunicate and absolved her subjects *en masse* from their allegiance to her. The lesson of the Reformation is the intense nationalism of the English people. There is the true ring in the anti-papal speeches in Shakespeare's *King John*. It is heard again to-day when a whole theatre bursts into laughter at the saying of the Roman ecclesiastic, in the epilogue to Mr. Shaw's *Saint Joan*, when he is reminded of the statue in Winchester Cathedral, ' as that building is temporarily in the hands of the Anglican heresy, I cannot answer for that.' But this nationalism was not one-sided. When the exiles who had fled from the Marian persecutors trooped back from Geneva, preening themselves in their new doctrines and new organisations, it did not take more than fifty years to show that they were repudiated by the English people. The Church would not allow departure from the old teaching of the Catholic fathers, and determined that the apostolic Orders of Ministers should be ' continued and reverently used and esteemed.'

The English Reformation shows that in this country a successful movement is the growth of centuries till it comes to maturity, and then is irresistible ; and that, to succeed, it must be a natural expression of the national character, not the result of an enthusiasm or a theory from overseas. There were not a few in later years who believed in the doctrines of the American, and even of the French, Revolution : but the mass of Englishmen did not, and so there was no revolution in England. The Reformation emphasised and

expressed the nationalism of England, and its success is to be accounted for by the fact that it was not in any real sense a class movement or a political movement, or the product of theoretic or geometrical minds. Burke, when his irony played round the constitutions of the French Revolution, may well have had the English Reformation in his thoughts.

(2) And this same outstanding fact of English life was worked out still more clearly in the days of the Stewarts. The most tolerant but the most determined Archbishop since the time of Henry VIII—and farther back—Laud, was eager that the English Church should be obedient to its own laws, both Catholic and national. Waves of political and foreign influence overwhelmed him: the *bourgeoisie* and the Scots triumphed for a time. But the English Church regarded King Charles as a martyr for the convictions which it had most at heart, and the King had his own again as the result of the most popular movement in all English history. Yet there was more left to us from the seventeenth century than this: there was left the assertion, which has grown stronger and stronger ever since, of the Christian virtue, and duty, of toleration; and the denial that doubt as to any doctrine, save that which is most fundamental, can shut the meanest out of heaven.[1] The Churchmanship of later Stewart days was very firm, very consistent, very gentle, very generous, and quite immovable in its determination 'to uphold the faith as this Church and realm hath received the same.'

It has often been thought that Churchmanship suffered, and so ultimately English Christianity also, during this period, through the steadiness of its attachment to the political constitution of the country. The fact is quite otherwise.

The men who stood by Charles I were the lineal ancestors of the men who resisted James II. Just as

[1] *Cf.* Laud, *Conference with Fisher* in *Works*, vol. i, pp. 60 *sqq.*

the theory of the divine right of Kings was an anti-Roman doctrine,[1] so the practice of passive obedience was anti-Erastian, anti-'political.'

(3) The contrast, a most striking one, is to be seen in the history of the Nonjurors. Some of the most saintly and simple as well as most learned men, clerk and lay, whom England has ever produced, found their theological influence, valuable and prophetic as it was in many ways, utterly discredited, and the protest of their renunciation entirely ineffectual, because they mixed their religion with their politics, that is with a political theory which the English people never had accepted and never would accept.

The pathetic impotence of the Nonjurors is one of the most significant facts in English history: the Church party which allies itself with a political party, whatever the name of that party may be, is doomed to discredit and decay. God gave it to His ministers to preach peace and ensue it, not to be judges or dividers among men. Clarendon, a thorough 'good Churchman' if ever there was one, and a thorough good man, expresses by anticipation the lesson of the Nonjurors' failure, when he exposes in scathing language the ineptitude of clerical politicians.

(4) With the noble inspiration of John Wesley a change comes over the spirit of our dream of the past. We are brought back again to the lessons of the Middle Age. If the State, dominated by Catholicism or by Puritanism, cannot suppress the free action of God's Holy Spirit, no more can the temporary rulers of the Church. It was no more use in the eighteenth century for the bishops or the parish clergy to deplore the excesses, or to ban the irregularities of the Methodists, than it had been for the monks to threaten the friars, or the Parliament of the Commonwealth to forbid the laity to be married in Church or to receive the Holy Communion according to the rite of the Book of

[1] *Cf.* S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603–1642, vol. ix, p. 145.

Common Prayer. There is certainly no lesson that should sink more deeply into the mind of to-day than the lesson of Wesleyanism, with its eccentricities, its sincerities, and its determined love of God and of the souls of men. Methodism was condemned by shallow and impatient thinkers—who have never been to seek in the English Episcopate—for the novelty of its devotions, for the new ways it discovered of worshipping and praising God.[1] If the new ways of ministering to souls which Wesley and Whitefield inaugurated had not been generally discouraged and often condemned, it may well be that Charles Wesley would never have felt obliged to say of his brother 'that he has renounced the principles and practice of his whole life: that he has acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations, and writings; robbed his friends of their boasting, and left an indelible blot on his name as long as it shall be remembered.' The bishops' ban on 'new devotions' led to a schism which every one of their successors must now unfeignedly regret. Truth is great and will prevail; but so is liberty; and danger and disaster lie in the way of endeavours to suppress her.

Yet it must not be forgotten when we search for the lessons of this time that toleration does not mean the ignoring of fundamental principles: neither does charity. Charity, certainly, can never be foolish; but toleration, if it is universal, may mean indifference, and indifference and Christianity are irreconcilable foes. Indeed the struggle between them was never more certain and more vital than it is to-day. Every religious Society must fix its own limits of communion, just as every trade union must fix its own terms of membership. When the Methodist Body came to repudiate the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer

[1] Yet it must never be forgotten that the great Bishop Butler, the wisest man of his age, told Wesley that 'the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing.'

as to the Orders in Christ's Church, it definitely marked its withdrawal from the Body to which Wesley to the end of his life claimed to belong. 'I declare once more,' he said, 'that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.' But 'Ordination meant separation,' because the terms of Church membership were unaltered 'since the Apostles' time.' At the end of the eighteenth century, as at the Restoration of Charles II, the Church required adherence from its members to definite and unaltered order.

This was seen quite definitely by that Evangelical body of Christian believers whom the noble enthusiasm of Wesley and Whitefield had inspired, who clung, at the time of separation, to the Church of England. Views of the meaning of Apostolical Succession might vary, as they do to-day; the historical knowledge of many might be vague and the constitutional theories which influenced them fluid; but the practical position was unaltered. Between those Evangelicals who almost worshipped John Wesley and those who, like Toplady, considered him to be moved by 'Satanic shamelessness and Satanic guilt' and regarded him as 'the most rancorous hater of the Gospel System that ever appeared in our land' there could be no alliance; but representatives of both could still believe that the Church of England had principles and an organisation which were more sound than those of Wesley, and more true. Unwisdom and short-sightedness lost the Church many of her children; but in those who remained there was a new life.

(5) So it was with the so-called Oxford Movement, a revival of much teaching which had suffered neglect, and mainly of that doctrine of the Church, the Body of Christ, the bride descending from Heaven adorned for her husband, which a prescient country priest [1]—

[1] Mr. Sikes of Guilsborough.

and to the wisdom of country clergymen England and the Church owe a great deal more than is generally remembered—had seen must be revived, in the providence of God, for the presentation to the people, in its due proportion, of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Oxford leaders, the 'Tractarians,' who sought to revive, in exact balance of truth, the beliefs of Englishmen, in a series of tracts 'against Popery and Dissent,' began their work by a protest which might seem to forget, as had been forgotten sixty years before, the cardinal need of charity and tolerance. But the sermons of Newman, the poetry of Keble, the work of Pusey for individual souls, soon showed that before all things they set the love of God and the love of man. There is an obvious contrast between their work and that of Wesley. The latter, however unwillingly, created a separation, and a new religious organisation looked to him as its founder ; and the Methodists, apart from the Church of England, could before very long be counted as millions. The Tractarians, like the followers of Wesley, revivified the life of the Church of England, but the departures, chiefly Romewards, from among them were negligible in numbers, and the work of the leaders was conspicuously to strengthen the Church of the Nation, while showing how closely, in the very fibre of its life, it was linked to the One Holy Catholic Church of the whole world, founded upon the Apostles and Prophets, having Jesus Christ Himself for its chief corner stone. Here the lesson is that every Society must have its principles and its limits ; and in those largely lies the hope of its continuity and permanence.

With the middle of the nineteenth century it is possible to discern a new spirit of breadth, a new impetus of expansion, in the teaching which the Church of England fostered within its bounds. There was extravagance on one side, as in the theory of Dr. Arnold,

one of those enthusiastic and inspiring masters of public schools whose constant danger it is to live quite apart from grown-up human nature and public life. There was rigidity on another side, from men whose personal devotion was founded too much on introspection. But beginning with the world-philanthropy of William Wilberforce, and the passionate protests on behalf of social righteousness of Edward Bouverie Pusey, the Church of England found a noble expression of its faith through Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley, Brooke Foss Westcott, and Henry Scott Holland. Though the details of their individual theology differed, these men all believed firmly in the Catholic Church founded by the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Church of England as its true representative in this land, holding the commission of the Lord and Saviour Himself.

'The longer I live the more I find the Church of England the most rational, liberal, and practical form which Christianity has yet assumed, and dread as much seeing it assimilated to dissent as to Popery.' There may have been a certain narrowness in these words of Kingsley, but they represent a strength of faith, carried out in a life of purpose, which has been of incalculable service, all through the Church's history, to the people of England. The strong sense of the power of association which lies behind these words, and behind the beliefs and work of these men, led to a firm adherence to the doctrine of the Church as the instrument of God for the conversion of the world. Thus they came to abhor disruption and to dread demagogues. From industrial associations they looked to Christian fellowship. 'The failure in those I have seen fail,' wrote Kingsley to a 'Manchester man,' 'has always been their democratic constitution and anarchy. The secret of success . . . has been the presence of one master mind.'[1] In the Church, they

[1] *Life of Kingsley*, ed. 1881, vol. i, pp. 275–6.

knew, the master mind has been Jesus Christ the Lord.

They knew (as Kingsley said, when he was passionately defending the 'Quicunque vult') 'The Creed says, and truly, that the knowledge of God, and it alone, is everlasting life.'

Association, enthusiasm, toleration; it has been hard for the leaders of the Church of England in the past to learn, in turn, these lessons. It took a long while for England, and the Church in England, to recover from the iconoclasm of the Reformation and of the Puritans, and from the monotonous complacency which the political connexions of the Hanoverian period involved. Reactions in English history have been fertile of harm; none more so perhaps than those which followed the enthusiasms of the Nonjurors and the Methodists. Pictures of neglected churches, slovenly worship, forgotten Sacraments, are at least as common in the middle of the nineteenth century as they are in the eighteenth, the sixteenth, the fourteenth or the eleventh. The slow recovery in the latter part of the nineteenth century had in it more than a tinge of Victorian self-satisfaction. It took long to win even wise men to the toleration of enthusiasm, for they were terribly frightened of eccentricity and strangely hampered by an idea of the duty of almost slavish obedience which a wider experience was proving to be obsolete.

Queen Victoria, honest and honourable to the core, and truly loving and religious, yet reached an almost fanatical abhorrence of anything which seemed to her to disparage Protestantism and encourage priestcraft. But she always put personal piety in the first place: she would never have been guilty of such a description as so sagacious a politician as James Bryce considered to embody the fit qualifications of Primate of All England.

'By the time of Queen Victoria the possession of piety and gifts of speech had become more important

qualifications, but the main thing was tactful moderation. Even in apostolic days it was required that a bishop should rule his own house well, and the Popes esteemed most saintly have not always been the best, as the famous case of Celestine the Fifth attests. An archbishop must first and foremost be a discreet and guarded man, expressing few opinions, and those not extreme ones. His chief virtue came to be if not the purely negative one of offending no section by expressing the distinctive views of any other, yet that of swerving so little from the *via media* between Rome and Geneva, that neither the Tractarian party, who began to be feared after 1837, nor the pronounced Low Churchmen could claim the Primate as disposed to favour their opinions. . . . The position which the Archbishop of Canterbury holds as the representative in Parliament of the whole Established Church makes statesmanship the most important of all qualifications. Learning, energy, eloquence, piety would none of them, nor all of them together, make up for the want of calmness and wisdom. Yet all those qualities are obviously desirable, because they strengthen as well as adorn the Primate's position.'[1]

In this absurd picture Lord Bryce seems to have thought that he described the shrewd and pious Archbishop Tait. It may almost seem to some that he was not entirely wrong, when we find that Primate regarding as offences which needed the condemnation of a devoted parish priest, candles lighted at the Holy Communion not for 'purposes of light,' 'green vestment, stoles, or whatever they may have been' and 'the unusual garments' the offender 'described' to him ;[2] and when we find on record some of his statements made during the progress through Parliament of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, a measure of which it appears that the Queen rather than himself

[1] Bryce, *Biographical Studies*, pp. 106–7.
[2] E.g. *Life of Abp. Tait*, vol. i, p. 234.

was the real author. The history of that Act is indeed instructive. It stirred up a vast quantity of bad blood, it led to the imprisonment of a hard-working parish priest, but it proved entirely ineffectual for the purpose —'to put down Ritualism'—for which it had been designed. Gradually failing to arouse even faint public interest, it died a natural death, proving once again that the English people are not a race of bigots, and that persecution, or prosecution, is utterly unable to quench a religious sincerity even if it shows itself in hitherto unfamiliar forms. The end of the Archbishop's life proved how thoroughly he had learnt this lesson.

(6) It may be convenient here, before we turn to the developments at the close of Queen Victoria's life, during the reign of Edward VII, and in the first quarter of the present century, briefly to sum up the foreign influences which have affected the Church of England. Of some, a word may be added later; but here it may be remembered that, strange though it may appear, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the moving force came from outside much less than has been often supposed. It is quite true that Calvinism, whether Scottish or Swiss, coloured the writings of many English theologians, and hardly received its death-blow even from the stalwart attacks of John Wesley. But the great English theologians, Christian philosophers, and ecclesiastical historians, are certainly not Calvinist: Hooker, Pearson, South, Berkeley, and Butler are conspicuously 'Anglican'; just as the school of Pusey claimed to be conspicuously Anglo-Catholic. The system of Calvin's *Institutio* was for a long time scotched, not killed; but slowly it yielded to the persistent tradition of English sanity and Catholicism. German pietism profoundly influenced the earlier convictions of Wesley, but it was not long before he became the stern critic, even the foe, of Zinzendorf and his followers. It came in again with

the good Prince Consort, and did not a little, with Evangelical support, to vindicate the purity and holiness of domestic life. But it was its practice rather than its theology which for a while influenced the aristocracy and the middle class. Not without regret can its practical extinction be registered to-day.

As wide, and perhaps more enduring, has been the influence of the masters of French devotion. The Liberal Catholicism which appeared in France with De Maistre and perhaps Chateaubriand, with Lacordaire and Dupanloup, Montalembert, Avisnet and others with whose writings Dr. Pusey and his followers made English folk familiar, was genuinely effective in inspiring many with deeper views of Christian obligation.

It might seem to some that this was a direct influence of Roman theology. But that it was not so is obvious from what, during this period, English spiritual writers accepted as well as what they rejected.

During the whole of the nineteenth century English theology, in all its main points, remained conspicuously Anglican ; and in nothing is this more clearly seen than in the lives of those who deserted the English Church for the fold of Rome. The contrast between the Catholic theologians of England and those of Rome remained (and still remains) emphatic. It is perhaps most conspicuous when the writings of Dr. Pusey, who was supposed to draw nearer to Rome than any other English Churchman of his time, are examined. Everything Catholic that Roman theologians taught, he, independently, accepted ; but what was Roman and not Universal found hardly an entrance, by the tiniest loophole, into his beliefs. Thus there is in him, as in so many of his predecessors, a certain rigidity. The tendency of his exact and accurate mind was to draw lines, to fix limits. But Christian belief could not be confined within the limits which he, or any man, would assign to it ; nor, as we see to-day,

could Christian worship. The Spirit moveth where He listeth, and age by age leads to a clearer knowledge of divine things, as well as—we may eagerly hope—to a closer walk with God. Here, then, is a lesson of English Church history. Rome seems (for the moment) incapable of advance. She relies in England on a certain boldness of assertion, which often, in political crises, is very effective, and on the amusing achievements of enterprising wits. Denied access, as it seems, to the avenues of advance in theology or philosophy, she betakes herself, in England, to historical or humouristic fictions. The lesson which seems plain is : Do not adopt the policy of the closed door. Scotland in the past has suffered greatly by it, and Rome suffers to-day.

III

With the beginning of the twentieth century we reach a period where it is still more difficult than before to estimate tendencies or to prophesy results. It is certain, however, that we have reached a time of wider expansion and greater freedom. Outwardly this is visible in the greater openness and publicity of life and the keener interest in ceremonial which accompanies it.

From the time at least of the Thanksgiving for the recovery of the Prince of Wales in 1872, the first occasion of great ceremony which some still living can remember, on to the Jubilee Celebrations of 1887 and 1897, the State began, rather slowly, to recognise that, with all its Protestantism, the British Isles had not lost, or had newly acquired, a distinct delight in pomp. Had the rather groping endeavour of ecclesiastics after accurate and impressive ceremonial in Church services originated this, or fostered it ? At any rate the bright garments, which frightened bishops, did not alarm soldiers. Military magnificence, dignified in

public imagination as 'the pomp and circumstance of glorious war,' made it increasingly difficult to deny the outward expression of dignity and beauty to the services of the Church. Prelates who had not known what a stole was soon became accustomed to hear, with apprehension, the words chasuble, dalmatic, tunicle; and to be informed by the Privy Council that it was the duty of the clergy in their cathedrals to wear copes. Magee had written to the Chapter of Peterborough requesting them to procure this garment: Mansel, at St. Paul's, compared himself in this regard to Zion in her anguish.

These little humours on the surface covered a gradual approach to the not unreasonable belief that the Ornaments Rubric in the Book of Common Prayer should be interpreted in its plain literal and grammatical sense. An Archbishop came to Canterbury who had a passionate, if not fully informed, interest in the beauty and lawfulness of Christian ceremony. Judgments, secular and ecclesiastical, began to be more favourable to the 'ritualism' in Church services which had become so conspicuous in the public celebrations directed by the Crown.

The great political legacy of the nineteenth century, the appointment of Commissions which should sit for a long period and produce lengthy reports which might lead to legislation, or, on the other hand, might be speedily consigned to oblivion, was eagerly accepted in the Church as well as in the State. The benefit of this was apparent chiefly in the freedom which it gave to a number of witnesses, expert or very much the reverse, to say exactly what they wished, and for their statements to become public property. While on the one hand representatives of a persecuting religious Association were allowed to swear that they had seen a thurifer suspended from the ceiling and a clergyman wearing 'a sort of purple bib which your deponent is informed is denominated an alb,' those whose

righteous souls were vexed with these trivialities gave utterance to a warning which should serve to arouse from the comfortable somnolence too customary in high quarters. When, in 1905, the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline examined a London clergyman who owed his opinions to F. D. Maurice as well as to the Catholic faith, and questioned him about some ceremonies at the Holy Communion, kissing the altar or making the sign of the cross, he answered that such were 'matters of infinitesimal importance compared with the facts that in the London diocese and the Canterbury province so many little children have no clean beds to sleep in, so many of our dearly beloved brethren have not healthy homes to live in, so many are out of work, so many are overworked, so many are underpaid.'

These things, cried the pedants quite truly, 'are not *in pari materia*.' But English ecclesiastics, some thought, are very slow to look facts in the face. The bishops had been so in the times of Pole and Gardiner, of Warburton and Watson, of Sumner and Monk. Would it need a social upheaval to make them turn from the serious contemplation of how to interpret sixteenth-century rubrics, or what liberty might be given to impetuous priests, to the text which lies at the root of all religion and stands ever to the complacent and the pre-occupied as a writing on the wall: 'Vanitas vanitatum, omnia vanitas, praeter amare Deum et Illi solo servire'? The lesson of all the great religious movements of English history, whether they were derided or accepted, lies there. From the Friars, the Reformers, the Puritans, the Nonjurors, the Methodists, the Tractarians, what survives is not detail but plain fact: that if religion is to have any hold on man it must be simply by an overpowering devotion to Almighty God.

This is the counterpart to the indifference for which twentieth-century, and particularly post-war, feeling

in England (and indeed all over Europe) has been not unjustly condemned. The impatience with which all regarded matters that a generation ago claimed a great deal of public attention is to a great extent an indication of a larger outlook, a learning more sound and complete, a charity deeper and more true.

'Everyone is absorbed in his own vineyard, and does not look on it as a part,' said Archbishop Benson[1] in 1886; and, a year later, 'the Bishops, and particularly the Archbishop, are slack in speaking out on the great moral questions.'[2] For men incessantly active in engrossing work, in which legalities and local difficulties stand side by side with personalities and enthusiasm, the difficulties must be stupendous. It is only on looking clearly at things in their due proportions that the work can be carried through. But quiet persistence, a truly English characteristic, carries wise aims to success. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance of this is the way in which by the patient and unrelaxed labour of sagacious leaders, clerk and lay, the freedom of the English Church to initiate legislation for herself has been secured. It is one step towards the autonomy which is allowed to almost every other institution in a free country. Limited, no doubt, it must be: mistakes there will be, and dangerous times. Mechanism is useful only as the means to a great end, and it is not uncommon for those who are engaged with it to become mechanical. There is a need—again to quote the Life of Archbishop Benson[3]—'not to rely much on men who are best known in Church Congress circles.' But the creation of the Church Assembly is a great achievement, and a landmark in English history.

We may seem to have turned aside from lessons to facts. But facts are lessons, when they are read by wise and courageous men. Through all these years perhaps the most permanent witness, the most potent

[1] *Life*, ii. 126. [2] *Ibid.* 131. [3] *Ibid.* 520.

leader in progress, is one we have hardly named. It is that in which Bishop Creighton found the meaning of the English Reformation, our starting point. In it we may find the hope of the future. Gradually the work of patient students bears fruit. Knowledge breeds charity, as well as sincerity and candour. There are three great desires, indeed passions, of Christians to-day : Reunion, Missions, Social Progress. It is knowledge, based upon sound learning and guided by Love, which alone will make these possible. English Churchmen are quite clearly drawing nearer to the Christians of the East, as all who have had the privilege of working for both well know. English Churchmen have, for the most part, a far better understanding of the Roman Communion than they had fifty years ago. English Churchmen are far closer in brotherly feeling towards the Dissenting[1] bodies, now commonly called Free Churches. And we are all growing nearer to each other in the realm of Sacred Study ; we profit by each other's researches and share each other's enthusiasm for the Truth. But we can proceed only on such lines towards the reunion of the Church of Christ. Most truly said the late beloved Bishop of Oxford[2] : 'We may be sure of one thing—no visible unity is worth having, indeed it would be shattered in a generation, if it is produced by diplomatic language and is the result of political arrangement. All parties must mean the same thing and know that they mean the same thing.' And they must know why. Never was the cause of Christian Missions more hopeful than to-day : and that is due not a little to the fact that the study of Anthropology and of Comparative Religion proves continually more effective an agent of the

[1] I prefer this word (which is that one officially used at the great Free Church Seminary of Mansfield College, Oxford) to the ambiguity of the other phrase.

[2] Dr. Burge in *Contemporary Review*, June 1925.

Church of God. And Christians everywhere are more and more united in the desire to treat all social questions in the spirit of the Lord : not as members of one political party, not as vendors of a special patent medicine, not as advisers of particular measures of secular power, but simply as believers in God, followers of Christ. To use words of Father Dolling,[1] whose life affords a lesson the most poignant to the leaders of the Church to-day, in all this, in all the problems that confront us, in all the demands for our action and our thought, ' the only claim that the Church of England has a right to make is that she stands a servant as her Master did.'

Freedom, but as the servant of all. That is what the history of the English Church teaches us should be striven for to-day. The dangers of the future are not to be combated by a dictatorial, but by a constitutional, Episcopacy. It may be that too much stress has been laid upon the uncanonical method by which bishops are now appointed, though too much reprobation cannot be bestowed on the intrigues and underground influences by which, according to Sir Henry Lunn,[2] ' preferment ' is sometimes secured.

It is not clear that better bishops are obtained in countries where election is free. But it is certain that freedom is the due heritage of the Church of Christ : freedom, not from association with the powers that be, ordained of God, but freedom to order her own worship, fix her own rules of membership, and declare her own beliefs.

Where, in the past, this has been obtained, the dangers of isolation and self-complacency have been escaped. Attempts in England, too generally inspired by politicians or indifferentists, to check the expression

[1] Those who wish to understand the difficulties of the English clergy, from above and below, can still do nothing better than read Canon Osborne's *Life of Fr. Dolling*—see p. 285.

[2] *The Review of the Churches*, Jan. 1926.

of devotion, to limit self-sacrifice and to stifle enthusiasm, have always failed. It is to be hoped that this lesson has been learnt by those—bishops, priests or lay folk—who have studied the history of the past. The evils of autocracy and the dangers to be apprehended from repression are alike with us still. Other dangers are slowly disappearing, though their causes may die hard.

The English, as compared with the Irish (and perhaps with the Scots), have never been a superstitious race, yet it cannot be said that the danger of superstition can ever lie far from the way of those who seek earnestly for spiritual life. Nor is this danger confined to Catholic practice. So the history of Methodism abundantly proves. And the Bishop of Birmingham quotes a case even to-day of baptism by a Nonconformist layman and tells that the water he used ' was preserved under cover in a jam jar that it might be applied to the child in case of illness.' [1] But such trivialities as these have only to be brought into the light to be seen in their absurdity. Sound learning will kill them. But learning is sound only when it is guided by love. Charity edifieth. And the building of Jerusalem in England to-day can come only from the unfettered following of Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

IV

Is it possible to sum up the lessons of these four hundred years and more? I doubt if it is; except by repeating the lessons of individual conduct and national policy which all wise men draw from all history and from the teaching and example of Christ. Yet, if it is, perhaps we may take as lessons two

[1] *Church of England Newspaper*; a sermon at Cambridge, May 16, 1926.

inferences which may undoubtedly be drawn from these centuries of English religious history. The first is the grave danger of drawing sharp lines, in prohibition or in permission, in regard to the expression, by different classes of men, in different ages, of the soul's approach towards God. Thus in regard to the controversy about the reservation of the Sacrament: while one may hope for a general agreement that it would be contrary to the lessons of Christian history and Christian charity to forbid reservation for the use of the sick and of those who are unable to communicate at the ordinary hours of service, one may go farther and say that to prevent the knowledge that the Sacrament is reserved in a particular place from reaching the worshippers in the Church, or to forbid prayers to God in that place, would be (if the lessons of history may be accepted) an unwarrantable and temerarious interference with Christian liberty, and would come dangerously near a resistance to the action of the ever-moving Spirit of God, which man can rarely anticipate and again and again is tempted (as in the age of the Friars, the Reformation, the Methodist revival, or the Oxford Movement) to misunderstand and resist.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that every corporate body, whether it be secular in its origin and aim, or spiritual in both, as is the Church of God, has the indefeasible right to draw up its own rules, and define its own limits, of membership. Thus in 1661 the action of the Church of England with regard to the ministry is capable of the fullest rational justification. And the attempts of those outside the body to dictate to it on theoretical grounds are quite unjustified.

And the second inference, or lesson, would be this: that we must be on our guard against one of the great defects of Englishmen, as individuals and as a nation—namely, what may be called the interfering habit. It

is that habit which makes us so much disliked abroad, and accentuates our disagreements at home. In our desire to give to foreign nations or to undeveloped races the benefits of the English constitution, or the public school system, we have continually done not only much good, but also a great deal of harm, and have often made ourselves supremely ridiculous. This is undoubtedly the danger of impressive and conscientious English officialdom, episcopal and other, at the present day. The attempt to draw lines and fix limits, though no doubt it is sometimes necessary, is always fraught with danger. In England, and especially in the English Church, it has almost always proved a complete failure.

When lines must be drawn, they should be drawn very generously. To allow wide freedom of opinion, but narrowly to limit the expression of opinion in action, can never be satisfactory or successful.

The monks could not crush the friars, or the bishops either the Reformers or the Wesleys or the Puseyites. The fact is that the English people are fundamentally sensible ; and also they have sometimes seen more clearly than their rulers, in Church or State, whither the Church was being led by the Spirit of God.

THE FAITH OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

BY THE RT. REV. WILLIAM TEMPLE, D.D.
(Bishop of Manchester)

SYNOPSIS

The personal outlook of the writer allowed for . . . pp. 31–34
I. Reaction of Christian tradition to Astronomy . „ 34–36
II. Reaction of Christian tradition to Biology and Evolution . . . . . „ 36–43
(*a*) As regards the Fall and Original Sin . . „ 36–38
(*b*) As regards the Incarnation . . . . „ 38–42
(*c*) As regards the Problem of Evil . . . „ 42–43
III. Reaction of Christian tradition to Psychology . „ 43–46
IV. Reaction of Christian tradition to the contemporary predominance of Science . . . . . „ 46–48

II

THE FAITH OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

My subject and its title were allotted to me, and though I readily accepted the invitation which I received, I must ask leave to explain the sense in which, for the purposes of this essay, I interpret the words 'The Faith of the Twentieth Century.' There will be no attempt to prognosticate what may be the dominant elements in that farrago of notions which is likely to be discoverable by the historian of the twentieth century among those who owe no allegiance to the Christian tradition. What I am concerned to do is to form some estimate of the outlook likely to prevail among professed Christians in the period now beginning, under the combined influence of their inherited tradition and the growth of human knowledge. It can only be a personal estimate; others would arrive at very different conclusions. And as, in a personal estimate, much must be allowed for the background of personal experience, I feel bound to begin with a few words of autobiography.

My father was a man who had been widely denounced for what would now be called Modernism. He had contributed to *Essays and Reviews*; and though his own contribution was held to be orthodox in its conclusions, yet those critics were plainly right who held that if once his method of approach were tolerated, the door was open for all kinds of development. It was not without reason that the storm of indignation which arose in conservative quarters directed itself largely against him. All this I realised as soon as I began seriously to think at all; yet by that time I knew already that he was almost universally

respected in the Church. When I was fifteen years old he became Archbishop of Canterbury at the age of seventy-five, and the echoes of the old indignations, which were then just audible, were on all sides treated as matter for ridicule.

As one considered this series of facts it was quickly apparent, first, that in many respects the public opinion of the Church had moved to the position which he had adopted in the forties and fifties of the last century ; but, secondly, that a complete reconciliation between his view and the general tradition of the Church had come about and, indeed, was possible, because he had held the essential elements of the Christian faith throughout. It was in the method of approach, not in the results attained, that he had been a pioneer and others had been imitators of him and his colleagues.

With this as the background of all one's thought about theological or ecclesiastical movements, it is natural to regard them with two expectations : one is that whatever the result, there will be no permanent quarrel between the essence of the traditional doctrine and the advancement of knowledge ; the other, resulting from this, is that whatever is truly of the essence of the tradition will survive. That is, indeed, a rather barren result, for it does not help us to determine what is of the essence of the tradition. A man can only make up his mind on that point to the best of his ability and then trust that the advance of knowledge will confirm it. To this I must return ; at present I am only stating the presuppositions of the estimate which I am about to offer.

Beyond the facts of my father's career, and, of course, penetrating far more deeply, was his influence and teaching. Here I will touch on only two points. Plainly he had the deepest possible reverence for the Bible ; but he neither utterly isolated it from other literature nor treated it as immune from criticism.

I remember his saying once 'The difference between Plato and Isaiah is not that Isaiah was inspired and Plato wasn't, but that Isaiah knew he was inspired and Plato didn't.' And again I remember expressing perplexity at Moses' description of himself as the meekest of men; my father did not discuss the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but said 'I expect he spake unadvisedly with his pen.' So I learnt that reverence for the Bible and a critical attitude towards it are quite compatible.

The other point I would touch on was his attitude to the Holy Communion; I do not refer to actual doctrine, for I do not remember what teaching he actually gave me about it and have only learnt his own doctrinal position by reference to what he wrote, and as that was not done till after my own critical faculties were at work, it falls outside the formative influences of which I am now speaking. But I got a deep impression of his insistence on the objectivity of the divine gift in sacraments, as of something in itself quite independent of our apprehension of it; and I remember, at a meeting of the London Society for the Study of Religion, the late Baron F. von Hügel turning to me with a passionate recollection of my father's intense insistence on this point. Yet it was equally certain that there was in his sacramentalism no trace of materialism. Here, again, he set my mind moving on lines which I believe to be sound but know to be due far more to his influence than to my own reflection.

I must add a word about the other chief influence on my mental growth. When I went from Rugby to Balliol I found at the head of the College a philosopher of world-wide repute, who made a profound impression on all members of the College by the depth and scope of his thought. Edward Caird seemed in a noble manner to exhibit in his own person the dignity of the intellectual life. But he was also an avowed Christian; he was a most regular communicant in the College

Chapel ; and his view of the world was spiritual through and through. Thus as I began any systematic study of philosophy I was under the influence of one whose philosophic authority was immense and whose philosophy found its culmination in a Christian theology ; and this, no doubt, encouraged a tendency to believe that when philosophy diverges from Christianity, it is because of some fault in itself, so that with deeper reflection it will return.

Such influences predispose a man to take an optimistic view of the relations between faith and knowledge. It is well to confess this at the outset, for any value that there may be in the estimate which follows must be calculated in the light of such considerations as these. And my object is to promote thought, not to gain adherents for my own opinions.

What may be the currents of thought in the last quarter of the twentieth century no man at the beginning of the second quarter can predict. Our concern must be with the relation between the Christian tradition on the one side, and those currents of thought, of whose existence and power we are now conscious, on the other : and, of these, one overshadows all the others ; it is the growth of scientific knowledge.

The Christian tradition is chiefly affected by the growth of scientific knowledge in four ways : (1) by the recasting of our mental picture of the universe at the hands of astronomy ; (2) by the discovery of the continuity between man and nature achieved by biology ; (3) by the new understanding of the processes of our thoughts and feelings reached by psychology ; (4) by the permeation of all regions of thought with the scientific habit of mind.

I

So far as readjustment in the traditional Christian view is required by astronomical discoveries, I had

supposed that it was made long ago ; but Dr. Inge has lately told us that we have not really discarded, or at least not openly discarded, the picture of the universe as existing in three storeys, which is apparently accepted in the Creed. If that be so, let it be done promptly. For myself I cannot remember a period of my life when I supposed that either Heaven or Hell were 'places,' situated in different parts of the universe—so early was the contrary doctrine impressed upon me ; and when I went up to Oxford in 1900—the last year of the last century—it would have been a definite shock to me to find any educated person who thought of Heaven as a place.

But it is urgently important to observe that the religious change involved in the newer view is negligible. The same records which speak of our Lord's Ascension also speak of His sitting at the right hand of God. Now there can be no possible supposition that the Jews of the first century supposed God to have a human shape with a right hand and a left ; and if the second phrase is a metaphor the first is at most no more than pictorial. We know very little about the Lord's risen body. The records suggest that He had the power of appearing in it where and when He would. The natural interpretation of the Ascension is not to regard it as a removal to another place in the astronomical universe, but as an acted parable signifying His liberation from all limitations of time and space. He is with God, so that whenever and wherever we are in God's presence we are in His presence also ; but that is always and everywhere. Because He is in Heaven He is everywhere on earth ; because He is ascended, He is here. There is only one document that needs alteration ; that is the 'Black Rubric' in the Book of Common Prayer, with its naïve assertion that Christ's natural body is 'in heaven and not here.' But few worshippers have ever even read the 'Black Rubric.' I cannot believe that Christians of the

twentieth century are going to have any special difficulties with Astronomy.

II

The shock administered by Biology is more recent, and any readjustment for which it calls touches more deeply the actual substance of Christian faith. It has made difficulties chiefly at two points : (*a*) in connection with the Fall, (*b*) in connection with the Incarnation.

(*a*) The doctrine of Evolution has definitely put out of court such a formulation of the doctrine of the Fall as that which we derive from St. Augustine. But the substance of the doctrine always was that we are by nature now, through whatever causes in the past, such that if left to ourselves we cannot be what God desires and requires us to be. For this conviction Evolution gives us a more secure basis than could ever be found in the ' first disobedience ' of our supposed first parents. The tendencies inherited from our animal ancestry are real and obvious hindrances to the attainment of those ideals which the distinctively human appreciation of absolute values leads us to set before ourselves. In Man nature has evolved a being capable of apprehending universal principles (Reason) and absolute obligation (Conscience). Here we reach a final term. Beyond the universal or the absolute it is plainly impossible to go. It is true enough that these powers reside in man without as yet controlling him. Plato's picture is still true. Man as we know him consists of a many-headed monster (Desire), and a lion (Pride), and a very small man (Reason). That which is distinctively human in actual humanity is a very small part of it ; but in itself it is a final limit of development ; here nature has produced something in touch with the Ultimate. In man's reason and conscience we find the image of

God. But this image is stamped—is indeed still being stamped—upon a material derived from an animal history : so the doctrine of Evolution suggests to us ; and thus it makes the doctrine, or rather the indubitable fact, of original sin intelligible, by relating it to the whole course of biological development. For sin, let us remember, is not the same as guilt ; it is all which keeps us from being what God desires and requires us to be. Much of it is unconscious. The worst of it is even conscientious. For there is nothing so desperately sinful as the sincere perverted conscience.

Evolution, then, establishes more firmly than ever what was always the chief religious element in the doctrine of the Fall. But it is worth while to point out that Evolution itself involves a very real Fall. For an act which is done at the prompting of desire by an animal conscious of no principle condemning that act or desire, is morally less evil than the same act done at the prompting of the same desire by a man who is conscious of the contrary principle and defies it. Thus human wickedness is worse than anything among the animals can be. This Fall is an element in the advance to the level of true morality. And as soon as we have ceased to read as history the myth in the Book of Genesis we see how profound its wisdom is. For this myth plainly puts together the ascent to conscious morality and the descent to deliberate sin. The promise of the serpent (never identified with the devil till after the Captivity, and far more accurately interpreted as a symbol of animality) is not denied by the divine judgment but reaffirmed. It would be plainly ridiculous to suggest that the story in Genesis and the doctrine of Evolution spring from the same view of things. But I should confidently maintain that the wisdom of the ancient myth and the theory suggested by modern knowledge are more closely akin to one another than either is to the set of notions which have held the field for a great part of the

intervening period. There is nothing paradoxical in this. It is not the first time that increasing knowledge has brought men back to the substance grasped by unsophisticated perception after a cruder reflection had led them away from it or had encrusted it with notions that had afterwards to be abandoned.

(*b*) At first sight the difficulties created by Evolution for believers in the Incarnation are still greater. But, whatever may be the truth concerning Evolution and the Fall, I am fully persuaded that the doctrine of Evolution supplies a background more in harmony with the Incarnation as presented in the New Testament than was supplied by the general notions which held the field before the theory of Evolution had won so wide an acceptance. According to the older view the Universe was created much as we see it now, and its various types (animals, vegetables, minerals,—or whatever other classification might be preferred) were fixed and mutually exclusive ; into this fixed and static order the Incarnation was an intrusion from without, having no analogy with the divine method as traceable elsewhere. But we, by the aid of the doctrine of Evolution, see the world as existing in strata, the higher not so much imposed upon as emerging out of the lower, and the lower finding completion in the higher. Broadly we may distinguish four such strata : Matter, Life, Mind,[1] and Spirit. Each of these when it first came was a novelty ; in the sense that it could not be inferred from what was there before, it was an intrusion. But it was an 'emergent intrusion,' if so paradoxical a phrase may be allowed ; that is to say, we, looking back, can find no precise place to draw a dividing line, but see only a continuous process, while it remains true that the earlier phases

[1] By Mind in this catalogue I mean the calculation of means to ends ; by Spirit the apprehension of universal principles and absolute obligation (i.e. Reason and Conscience) and the consequent necessity of choosing between ends.

of that process give of themselves no ground for anticipating the later phases.

Each of these main divisions of the existing world has a more or less, but never quite, complete order of its own, which is studied by the appropriate science. Physics and Chemistry, Astronomy and Geology, study Matter; Biology in all its phases, from Botany through Zoology to Physiology, studies Life; Psychology and Logic study Mind; Logic again and Æsthetics and Ethics (which should be understood as including Politics) study Spirit. Not one of these sciences finds itself confronted with a closed system uninfluenced by the other systems; but the systems are sufficiently independent of one another to make possible and fruitful the separate study of them. But the methods of the sciences are different, according to the varying nature of the subject-matter. There is in the universe both real unity and real diversity; and there is in the process of its evolution both real continuity and real novelty.

Christianity takes Theism for granted; so the Christian Evolutionist sees this continuous process from novelty to novelty as the unfolding and fulfilment of the purpose of God. In that process a stage was reached with Man, where touch was established with the ultimate because Spirit (Reason and Conscience) is, as we saw, a term beyond which progress is even demonstrably impossible in its own departments of Truth and Goodness. Here we find, as was said, the image of God. But for this reason there was possible an Incarnation, an act of God entering newly into humanity to unite it with Himself. It was an act in full analogy with the introduction or emergence of Life and Mind and Spirit. But because it was a direct activity of God, the Birth of the Incarnate was of a woman (the passive or receptive element in human procreation) but not of a man (the active element). This point is, however, for our present purpose

subsidiary. My main point is that while the Incarnation is on one side an act of God unique in kind, because it was an immediate intervention comparable not to the origination of the various phases of life but only to the continuous act of the universal creation, on the other side it is in full analogy with the divine method traceable in all the rest of the creative process.

And this intrusion, which yet is no intrusion but only the full self-manifestation of Him who was guiding and manifesting Himself in all the process, initiates a new evolutionary phase ; just as Life supervenes upon Matter, Mind upon Life, Spirit upon Mind—so upon Spirit, as hitherto known, there supervenes what we may call Adoption. After vegetables, animals—in which the vegetable principle persists ; after animals, man—in whom both the former persist ; after man, made in the image of God, the sons of God.

We have often not recognised how full the New Testament is of this thought of a new phase. It speaks of God as the Father of all men, and by implication of all men as His children ; but in fact it reserves the name ' sons ' or ' children of God ' for those who, having accepted the God-Man as Lord, have received the spirit of adoption—the love of God revealed in Christ calling forth from them an answering love strong enough to subdue all lower passions, so abolishing the power of original sin and making them worthy of their status as God's children. St. John is explicit : ' He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God.' The process (like all such processes) is slow. ' Now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if He shall be manifest we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.' St. Paul has just the same conception : ' As many as

are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God.' But he reads it in connexion with the whole cosmic process ; it has all been leading up to its own climax in the manifestation of these 'sons of God,' whose coming will be enough to justify all the groaning and travailing through which that climax is reached. We know something of it, for we have the firstfruits of the Spirit ; but we know little, for we have only the firstfruits.

Plainly that is an evolutionary view of the world with the Incarnation and its results set in direct connexion with it. We ought not to be surprised at this. If Christianity is true, then inasmuch as all Truth is one, it was inevitable that the first flash of its illumination in its own special sphere—the moral and spiritual life—should lead to intuitions into other parts of truth till these were obscured again by rudimentary science and current conventions. Anyhow, I hope I have established my main point. Evolution is not an enemy of the Christian faith but a friend ; it provides a background for Christianity which is akin to its own leading conceptions,—so much so that the great theologians of the New Testament were led by the intensity of their Christian faith to leap towards an evolutionary view of the universe while the scientific discovery of it was still in the far distant future.

Two problems are often raised : (i) How on the evolutionary hypothesis can perfection become so soon ? (ii) How is it, if God has entered humanity, that there is so little to show for it ? Neither of these presents a serious difficulty.

(i) What is come in perfection is the archetype which has still to be reproduced in all the relations of life. The purpose of creation is not fulfilled by the appearance of one instance of perfection. That was the inauguration of an era of which the perfecting of all men in all their dealings is the goal. St. Paul exhibits this in outline in the consistently evolutionary

Epistle to the Ephesians, where the coming of Christ in the flesh is the initiation of the building up of His Body, the Church, into which all races are to come ; and only when Christ has thus at His disposal all peoples with all their various gifts shall we know the measure of the stature of His completeness—all that He is in Himself and can be to us. There is plenty of room for further progress. By all human calculation, judging from the past, the earth is likely to be cold before the phase of progress initiated by the Incarnation reaches its end and goal.

(ii) But why is the process so slow ? If God has given Himself to man that He might unite man to Himself, why is man still so unlike God ? If in Christ there was inaugurated a new evolutionary phase—the sons of God—why is it so hard to distinguish these sons of God from carnal men ? Spiritually, of course, the answer is to be found in our unfaithfulness. But if we are concerned (as we are at present) to explain the fact rather than to correct it, we shall remember that all the stages have been very slow to reveal their distinctive character. The most rudimentary animals are only just distinguishable from vegetables ; man is called a rational animal, but reason scarcely governs at all the life of a savage, and does not govern very much of so-called civilised man. Man is called rational because he is known to be capable of becoming such. Christians are to be called sons of God because they know the power that is making and can perfectly make them such.

(*c*) There is indeed one perennial problem which is intensified by the belief of Evolution—this is the problem of Evil. Formerly some persons continued to satisfy their minds by attributing all evil to the Fall ; but this always involved a certain blindness to the facts of nature. Some theologians, as for example Canon Peter Green, attribute all evil to the Fall, but, to make this cover the facts, regard the Fall as pre-mundane,

that is, as previous to the creation of the physical world. This is open to other objections, the exploration of which would take us too far afield to be undertaken here. I am myself convinced that the solution of this difficulty lies in the formation of sound philosophic views as to the relation of Time to Eternity. I believe that the Time-process is an advance from the inert to the spiritual, and that the occurrence of evil is incidental to this process ; this does indeed involve the belief that the Creation as it came from God (so to speak) contained evil in principle ; but its whole course is a progressive conquest of evil, so that when seen from the view-point of Eternity evil appears as a moment in the perfection of the eternal Good. But this view can here be only indicated.[1] My main point at the moment is to insist that evolution may have brought the problem into more prominence, but by no means originated it, and to imagine that theology formerly had no trouble with it is a mere illusion.

To sum up this section in a simple sentence : I am convinced that the Christian faith of the twentieth century will welcome Evolution as a friend, and find, by means of it, ways of presenting its unchanging principles more intellectually satisfying than were open to it before science suggested this way of conceiving the cosmic process.

III

More formidable, as I think, in the period before us, though essentially even less well grounded, will be the difficulties arising from public interest in the various forms of psychological theory. Many who dabble in this subject, and even many who write books about it, ignore the fact that Psychology provides no criterion of truth. It traces the processes by

[1] I have tried to elaborate it in the chapter on The Problem of Evil in *Mens Creatrix* and the chapter on The Atonement in *Christus Veritas*.

which people tend to form opinions ; it has nothing whatever to do with the question whether the opinions so formed are in fact true. That is really all that needs here to be said. For, formidable as the difficulty is likely to be, this is the principle of its solution in all the forms that it may assume. If the existence of God, and the possibility of communion with Him, are in themselves improbable, the psychological explanation of processes by which belief in God and the sense of communion with Him might arise, would undermine the empirical evidence for both of these. But if the existence of God and the possibility of communion with Him are in themselves probable, no explanation of how men might come to think there is a God if there were not can in the smallest degree affect that probability. The fundamental difficulties originating from interest in psychology are in fact all due to a confusion of psychology with philosophy (more strictly, with epistemology and metaphysics). That confusion is by no means easy to clear away from minds in which it has arisen, and there is no doubt that it will be a source of real difficulty in presenting the Church's appeal and claim ; but it remains a mere confusion.

The psychological attack consists in saying that belief in God either is a ' compensatory hallucination ' or is due to auto-suggestion. Now a great deal of religious practice is plainly quite deliberate auto-suggestion. Devout persons come together to stimulate their sense of the presence of God. But this is not the reason for belief in God, even if in the case of particular persons belief is historically grounded in such experiences. What happens is that people who for one reason or another believe in God—the validity of that belief being a subject for philosophical enquiry —unite together to quicken that belief into a vital apprehension.

But there are other problems, less fundamental, with which general interest in psychology is presenting

us. On the one side psychology brings reinforcement to many of the practices customary in the Catholic Church. Those practices grew up under the guidance of experience rather than of theory, and correspond very exactly with the actual state of the human soul. In the confessional very much of psycho-analysis and of suggestion were familiar ; in such aids to devotion as the rosary the Church recognised the importance of sub-conscious or semi-conscious processes. Protestantism has pushed to excess the tendency to make all worship an affair of conscious intelligence, will, and feeling ; even when it is sentimental, its sentiment is usually determinate. Under the influence of psychology we must expect to see a great revival of many discarded practices. And in large measure this will be good ; it will help to make religion more vital to simple folk who can be more easily impressed through vivid suggestion than through argument or exhortation. And more scope will be given to the mystical tendency, which, as a rule, delights in symbolism.

But in all this there is a great danger. It is right that religion should appeal to the whole man, who is always more than intelligence, and in whom intelligence is usually a minor element. But its aim must not be only to appeal to him as he is, but so to appeal to what he is that he may become something better. And the way of progress is always towards the more conscious and the more rational. The great danger is that, finding through psychology the way to ' quick returns ' by appeals to the non-rational in man, religion may in fact encourage him in irrationality. Already Rudolph Otto's great book ' The Idea of the Holy ' (Das Heilige) is being exploited in the interest of irrationalism. It is most unfair to Otto, who, though he is writing of the non-rational in religion, insists that the higher the religion the more rational it is. That sense of awe of which he speaks is essential to religion. But it can by various contrivances be induced without

any regard to the presence of an object worthy of it. This is idolatry. It must be induced, or there is no religion. But it must be directed to the one Object which reason pronounces worthy of it—perfect Goodness—or the religion will be perverted ; and perverted religion is worse than none.

We must not avoid the danger by refusing all appeals to the non-rational elements of our nature. But we have great need to take care that the total effect of the appeal is to develop the supremacy of Reason and Conscience alike in Religion and in the conduct of life ; for it is this, and not a capacity for profound mystification, which is the image of God in Man.

IV

We have glanced at the probable influence of certain sciences on the Faith of Christians in the coming period. But the whole advance of Science has created a habit of mind which must itself have a very profound effect. Science always tends towards precise analysis and the kind of understanding which this facilitates. But this is never an intimate understanding. The psychological analysis of a personality, for example, is something quite different from acquaintance with the person. For science is a form of mental restlessness—it asks Why ? and Why ? again. Its method of understanding is to see its object as consisting of all its parts distinguished from one another, and as related to an ever-widening context of other objects. For any intensely personal activity, such as Religion should be, this is most perilous. It is indeed a safeguard against the degradation of Religion into superstition ; but it is liable to save it from that degradation at the cost of eviscerating it. There is great need for the mind of our age to supplement the intensely strong influence exercised upon it by Science with the influence of the antithetical activity which is

Art.[1] Art also is a method of understanding—a method not of restlessness but of concentrated repose; the initiate gazes upon the scene, or picture, or statue, or lets the ordered movement of sound play over his soul, until he is one with it, and it with him; he understands by union with the object; he is not idle—he is intensely active, as subsequent exhaustion will convince him; but he is active in receptivity. And every deep aesthetic experience is on the borderland of worship.

I am not saying that Art is more precious than Science either for life or for religion; I am only saying that life and religion need both; and the mind of our age tends to be dominated by Science only. We shall not correct this by putting tawdry pictures in our church, or introducing sentimental hymns and tunes into our services. That merely intensifies the evil, because it satisfies the rudimentary artistic cravings and so leaves the mind open again to the unchallenged sway of Science. I am told that people love singing the hymn 'Hark! Hark! my soul,' to Henry Smart's tune; I can only reply that the more they love it the more harm it will do them. On the other hand, it is no good to offer to untrained folk such poetry and music as only the most sophisticated appreciate. But there is much great hymnody and much great music that has a direct appeal to the simplest: and it should be widely used. This is not a trifling matter; it is vital to the healthy balance of the spiritual life.

There will plainly be many strains and conflicts for the Christian faith to pass through in the twentieth century; and there will be many due to causes which cannot now be anticipated. But I am convinced that in the main it will be a period of consolidation, not of dissolution; and of aggression, not of mere defence. The period when Christianity had to content itself

[1] 'The opposite of Prose is not Poetry, but Verse; and the opposite of Poetry is not Prose, but Science.'—S. T. Coleridge.

with warding off attacks from the chief intellectual forces of the day is, I am convinced, already ending. In the period before us we shall rather see Christianity come forward with the challenge that intellectually, as practically, it can offer a more comprehensive, a more penetrating, apprehension of Reality than any rival; and that, even if judged by intellectual standards only, though that is to abandon half its claim, it can afford a satisfaction that is nowhere else attainable.

THE FUTURE OF WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY THE REV. F. W. DWELLY, M.A.
(Canon of Liverpool)

SYNOPSIS

Indications of the future of worship in the Church of England. What do we mean by corporate worship and by revision? The relation of an act of worship to the worshipping life . . . . . pp. 51–53

I. The emergence of the spirit of worship. Worship and sacrifice. The Eucharist. The development of the forms of Christian worship out of the Jewish forms of worship . . . . . ,, 53–58

II. New forms of worship. The form of Eucharist and of Morning and Evening Prayers and Liturgical hours. The English Prayer Book. The attempt to relate modern life to the new vision of God in worship. Two objections to the new vision . . . . . ,, 58–61

III. Alternative forms of worship. Four Liturgical suggestions presented to the Revisers. The problem of providing variety within the canon of the Communion office. Six questions concerning the canon . . ,, 61–67

IV. Concerning psalms and hymns and spiritual songs . ,, 67–68

V. Unreality in worship. The anxiety of the Parochial Clergy. Psychology and worship . . . . ,, 68–70

VI. Worship and unity . . . . . p. 70

III

THE FUTURE OF WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THERE are many indications that in the future the corporate worship of the Church of England will be more simple, more intelligible, and more comprehensive than heretofore; that the Church will be more alive to the movements of the Spirit of God in the discoveries and in the adventures both of the mind and of the spirit of man; and that in the near future the subjective element within corporate worship will, once again, be a great regenerative factor:

> When the High Heart we magnify,
> And the sure vision celebrate,
> And worship greatness . . . .
> Ourselves are great . . . .

When I use the words 'corporate worship' I am thinking of a public act offered to God by a group of Christians deliberately standing among fellow believers, in a realm of the Spirit where love-aspiring souls greet one another as together they present themselves before Him, Whose Spirit inspires them all, that they may hear His call, and together with countless numbers who have put off mortal flesh and with all the heavenly host participate in His glad fellowship.

Is not this the 'two or three' gathering about Jesus in love and finding themselves in thanks and joy at once at the heart of 'Abba,' the Father?

If forms of worship arise, as arise they must, and if in process of time these forms prove to be inadequate, what is to be their revision? Is it not a new vision

seen through the eyes not of man the priest, but of man the prophet, whereby forms grown old become sufficiently new to fit men in the new day ?

And is not this revised corporate worship the hope of the future of the Church of England ? A corporate worship wherein the family, in His name, is joying in the Father. A revision that is the free daring of His prophets keeping touch with ' Holy Spirit the Pioneer ' as ever He leads us on.

It would be contrary to the genius of the English Church to consider the act of worship apart from the worshipping life.

' Ye that . . . are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways, draw near . . .'

So runs the invitation at the great service of the Church. If we tried to consider them separately we should tumble into unreality, for we should be considering an act that is unkindled by the fire of encouragement, uninformed by the light of understanding and unrelated by the wonder of hallowing. An act of worship is a natural means of expressing a worshipping life. Through it the corporate life, being directed to the Father by relating the whole creation to Him, by hallowing as His Name everything that is beautiful, good and true, expresses the wholeness which is the worshipper's inheritance in Christ Jesus.

To live without an act of corporate worship is, for the worshipper, to be as unnatural as is the lover who refuses the kiss to his beloved or the friend who has an objection to friendly greetings. The act of worship is a corporate rejoicing in the eternal order of the kingdom, and the worshipping life enables that order to rule on earth. The worshipping life inspires other men to determine to do His will, and the act of worship identifies the offering of the will of man with

the will of our Lord and with the wills of the pioneers of every age and clime. Actually the worshipping life is the prelude to the act of worship as 'Hallowed be thy name' is the prelude to the Lord's Prayer.

In the fulfilment of both we have 'the kingdom, the power, and the glory for ever and ever.' Time and space disappear. The soul of man is caught up and breaks through to Him, Who is for ever 'breaking through' to meet His children.

I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE SPIRIT OF WORSHIP

Exactly when the spirit of worship first emerged in the life of humanity no one can say. That it emerged and was not arbitrarily imposed from above or artificially worked up by men of fear is quite clear both from the evidence in religious literature and from the experiences of present-day worshippers.

The emergence, as we know it, is not far removed from the great moment when the soul hunt is triumphant. The soul of man must go a-hunting. At first he knows not why, he only knows the urge. He captures fancy after fancy and is disappointed; he is merely a capturer of fancies until that moment when, penetrating the upreaching forest of the eternal, he apprehends and is apprehended by an unseen power which pervades his whole mind and spirit. He tastes and sees how gracious the Lord is. Something happens. Is this the emergence of the spirit of worship? Certain it is that when he goes forth from this experience it is to relate everything in life to the supernatural and to fling himself into activities that have a relating significance. When he returns from his daily duties it is to offer himself with the friendly and unbloody spoils that he has gained during the day for the fellowship and for God. At work and at play he is accompanied

by a renewed capacity for surprise. He wonders at the things before him and is able to sense worth and its significance as a faithful dog can sense the whereabouts of his master.

The fullest way of conditioning the self for the emergence of the spirit of worship, is by the practice of sacrifice.

Spiritual sacrifice is a most true and satisfying way of worship as well for the group as for the individual. By it individuals or groups are able to capture the highest, and at once proceed to surrender to the captured. Here is the God-set desire for capturing God and at the same time being captured by God. It is the soul of man playing at hide-and-seek in eternal life, a game which requires for its fullest enjoyment a family of worshippers. This we can trace right through in the development of religious forms in the Bible.

The moment seekers, often hunting in packs, come upon Him Whom they have been unconsciously seeking, they present themselves before Him, desirous that He shall make them captives. They acclaim Him King, Lord, Redeemer.

Will some of my readers shrink at my putting our pursuit of God and His pursuit of us thus frankly ? Do they think me raw, bordering upon the pagan ? After all, is not this the doctrine of grace and the clean, naked, lovely truth ?

In the process of time a better name than King was found. They spoke of God as Father and their leader spoke of Himself as the Good Shepherd, perhaps because He had found them, and lo ! joy everywhere abounds ; far more likely because the mystic lamb is remembered when the name Shepherd is mentioned. Now the lamb denotes sacrifice. ' Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast.' So they sang at the family meal, the Eucharist, the eternal sacrifice. The story runs that at this outward

and visible sign of sacrifice, at this service, the spirit of worship emerged as at no other time. The conviction grew through the ages that the service of Holy Communion is corporate worship *par excellence*.

This, upon analysis, is not surprising, for the sacramental principle is itself the backbone of the worshipping life.

Surely this worshipping or sacrificial life could have no better outward sign than the Blessed Sacrament! It is a secondary matter that among faithful Churchfolk there is to be found different kinds of emphasis upon the mode of divine operation, for as Canon Oliver Quick has recently shown, the declaratory view of the Sacrament is not opposed to the effective view, but rather, each, in the end of the argument, depend the one on the other for reality.

This is the story that we find in the early Christian Church. The apostles and immediate disciples perceive the worth of Jesus. They apprehend God as taking delight in His family in His rich social joy. Each one of them contributes to the joy of the other because in so doing joy is given to Jesus. This cannot be done alone; they come together to talk about Him Whom they worship, to affirm their delight in Him, to acclaim Him as their hearts' desire and the hope of life. Thus His spirit of worship emerges, He dominates all their individualities and they become one personality, one body, adoring Him, partaking of His life as they partake of one loaf, greeting one another as fellow aspirants for their friend's 'well done.' They present themselves to Him in thanksgiving and praise; they break bread and sing to Him. They sing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. Thus a Christian form of worship takes shape. They cannot make up new hymns, and what need? Are not the Jewish Benedictions at hand, and do not all know them? These Benedictions, these praises to the Father, are in a form familiar to them all, so they use this Jewish

Synagogue form of worship to express that spirit of adoration which they had caught from Jesus. Corporate worship is so rich a living experience that they must needs bring in children and friends to join at worship. The fathers pass away, but the children and friends retain the forms, sometimes, alas! without the vital experience. Then it is that unreality creeps in. The forms, with nothing more than association to give them life, begin to assume too great an importance. Forms are important because of the glowing experience that brought them into being. The early vital experience was not entirely evaporated; perhaps that was impossible, so indefeasible was (and is) the spirit of worship.

During this time, in every Church, groups of Christians had been seeking fresh news of Jesus, and had seized upon new experiences of the power of the Spirit of Jesus. These experiences the early Christians told over at their gatherings for worship. Many of these experiences were spoken in mystic language, and in this language they were incorporated in forms of worship.

The worshippers were considered to be capable of divining the inner secrets enshrined in these forms of worship. It was not to be thought that any would deal with mystic experiences in a literal manner. Either gaping, as it were, at mystic experiences of a former age and not looking for the inrushings of a spirit who can ever rush in again; gaping as if at relics, with superstition and without lively hope.

Special eucharistic services were held on the days set apart for honouring the memory of departed witnesses. The days of saints who had died for Jesus were held in great honour. Generations pass by, and so many as two hundred and forty-six creeds or formularies of faith and some ninety-five liturgies come into existence.

It is worth while noticing how, at a given time and

place, the worshipping life of the Christian community was sacramentally caught up and expressed in the act of Holy Communion ; how this early experience of Christian worship, as distinguished from the worship of God by the Jews, was crystallised. It is important that we should see this in detail, for this sacramental act is the core of worship in the English Church.

Everywhere the form of worship in very early Christian days was substantially the same as that used by our Lord Himself—recitation of sentences of Scripture, the prayers and praises known as the Eighteen Benedictions, the Psalms, a lesson from the Law, a lesson from the Prophets, an explanation of the lesson (we should call this the sermon), and added to this the family prayers of the Jewish household when, on the eve of the Sabbath, the head of the family, standing at the family table, would take a cup of wine in his right hand and a loaf of bread in his left hand, bless them, and then distribute them. (Readers who wish to see this in detail should consult Dr. Oesterley's 'Background of the Christian Liturgy.')

Later on the worshipping life of the Christian community, as far as knowledge is concerned, passed under a tunnel. It came out into the light again in the 'Didache' with prayers not unlike St. John xvii and Revelation xxii, but it is most clearly seen when Cyril of Jerusalem described his form for celebrating Holy Communion.

By about the fourth century a complete Communion Service was settled. It has been described for us in the *Apostolic Constitutions*:—(1) For the general congregation lessons from the Old Testament interspersed with Psalms, and a passage from the Epistle, a portion of the Gospel, a Sermon ; and then (2) the general congregation is dismissed, and for the communicants only there is the prayer for the faithful, the Kiss of Peace, the offering of Bread and Wine, with

the cheering and cleansing 'Lift up your hearts' followed by the Sanctus. Then come the words of institution, as we know them, and the oblation and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, intercessions, the invitation to communicate with the words: 'Holy things to holy people.' After Communion came thanksgivings and the Benediction. It should be noticed that here as always in the early Church the minister felt quite free to use his discretion and to draw upon inspiration in leading his people in prayers and in praises.

II

NEW FORMS OF WORSHIP

Now in those days, side by side with the Christians who spoke Greek, there lived many Christians who spoke only Latin. Also, about this time, the tendency to gather into monastic colonies took hold upon certain types of Christians. We find, then, two forces tending to create new forms of worship: (1) the dividing off into 'nations' according to language, and (2) the monastic division of Christian life into 'secular' and 'religious.'

The monastic communities were self-contained. No merchant master and no wife nor children could call a man hither and yon during his day. And so, when men came to live in communities, when the call came from the oratory to worship they were free to worship and thus services were multiplied. Periods of prayer were organised to suit the passing hours: in the day and night; at morning and evening, at noontide, at midnight and at cock-crowing, and so on and so forth, until for most of the hours of the day there was some little act of worship—very beautiful as long as it was spontaneous, as long as formalism laid not its deadly hand upon it. The bell was rung for Vespers at sunset, Compline at bedtime, Nocturns at midnight, even Matins also at midnight! (What a

juggling with intentions when Matins may be said before you go to bed! How queer, playing with your conscience about your prayers and saying your morning prayers the night before!) But we must continue to set down the exact state of affairs—Lauds at sunrise, Prime at the beginning of work, Terce at the third hour or middle of the morning, Sext at the sixth hour or midday, Nones at the ninth hour or middle of the afternoon.

Criticism from the reform side has dealt severely with these 'hours' of monastic worship. I grant that they tended to become debased, to become perfunctory, things to be ticked off the duty list; but on the other hand we must not forget how these monastic 'hours' have enriched our liturgy.

It will be a duty of liturgists in the next few years to recover some of these treasures for the optional use of the English Church. All the while that the liturgy was growing under monastic influence the character of the English people was becoming stronger and more distinctive. The demand for English ideas necessarily called into existence a fuller and better use of the English tongue. Political changes and internal aspirations ran together into such an agreed union of leadership in the national life as made possible a new emergence of the spirit of worship. As the forms of worship had been translated and improved out of Hebrew into Greek, out of Greek into Latin, so they were revised and translated into the English tongue. The night services that had been adapted to the lives of monks were fitted to the lives of ordinary people. Vespers and Compline became Evening Prayer; Nocturns, Matins, Lauds, and Prime were put together and made Morning Prayer. The Venite, the Te Deum, the Benedicite, and the Benedictus stand in the same order as they did in the Latin book. So in Evening Prayer with the Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis. The Bible had greater prominence in the

people's services of worship. The English loved the Bible, so it was read at greater length. Elaborate musical interruptions and prayers annoyed the English temperament, so these interruptions were shortened. The Versicles and Responses—arranged about the sixth century—remained as they were. Collects for Peace—first used when the barbarians were battering the walls of Rome—were also retained.

Three hundred years pass by, and God gives to the Church of England men who can make noble traditions as well as receive them. It is true to say that the prophets of the Church in our own day are bold to declare a new vision of God and to demand that the revised forms of worship shall be in accord with the most advanced interpretation of life that God has vouchsafed to this generation in the world of beauty, of truth, and of goodness. It is happily true also to say that the priests in our day encourage the prophets, and do not as in Old Testament times refuse to reinterpret their liturgical treasures or even blind men's eyes to the light God sheds on each succeeding generation.

Moreover the elders of the Church of our day are not content to spiritualise the dreams given to the old : they are eager to understand if not to participate in the vision of God that is vouchsafed to the young—a vision of God revealing Himself in ways undreamed of by His Saints of early ages ; God (Whose world once appeared to our forefathers as wide and loose and separated) revealing His world as a small, compact and interrelated portion of His universe ; God giving to the scientist his discernment, to the engineer his skill, to the pioneer his daring, to the healer his understanding ; God (to Whom men of the monastery once appealed for intervention) revealing Himself as the sustainer of every form of good life and a partner in prayer by the laws which He has made. That God, who in the early Jewish liturgies was worshipped as the defender of a favourite people and

the enemy of all other mankind, is now seen to be the lover of the whole human race and the enemy only of the self-centred would-be favourite. This vision of the ever-revealing God calling to our age by new voices must be acknowledged, say the prophets ; our liturgies must be so revised that these Names by which God was not known to the Church of 300 years ago, but by which He is to be interpreted in later days, shall be acclaimed in the worship of the Church.

There are, of course, certain objectors, notably two—one group of men who allow too much discussion as to whether this or that custom is or is not primitive ; and the other a group of men who are timid of alternatives.

I would venture to suggest to those who question whether this or that custom is or is not primitive, that it does not matter over much whether it be primitive or not. Nothing is gained by proving that one form or ceremony is more primitive than another ; nothing is lost by admitting that this or that item in the vast aggregate of historical developments is somewhat later than another. We are apt to confuse historical continuity with ancient form, two very different matters which it is pitiful to mistake, the one for the other.

III

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF WORSHIP

Has the objection to alternative forms of worship sufficient reason to give it nugatory weight ? Its value is surely one of sentiment and association. If so, this objection ought to be carefully tested before it is allowed to block development by its dead inertia. Consider, is it not true that in the Jewish form of worship there were many alternatives, that in Old Testament days there were two forms of the Commandments and more than one alternative reading

of the history of the revelation of God? Certainly in the New Testament there is an alternative form of the Beatitudes, and even the great prayer of consecration—known to us as the Lord's Prayer—is given in an alternative form, one by St. Matthew and one by St. Luke. Moreover we have alternatives in the Book of Common Prayer; we choose not only in a relatively small matter such as the Prayer for the King; but in regard to the Canon itself we have, as it is, to choose between the Prayer of Oblation and the Thanksgiving.

We have already noticed that up to the fourth century the prayers and praises were left to the freedom of the minister. Between the year 400 and the year 1500 the greater centres of Christendom had their own peculiar uses, each being jealous of its cherished inheritance, and all of them for ever struggling against the tendency to undue uniformity. The argument that the unity of the Church stands or falls by a uniform liturgy is thus seen to carry no weight whatsoever. During the Middle Ages there was a tendency toward a dominant use. Charlemagne worked hard for such a common use throughout Western Christendom, but Charlemagne's major ambition was to unify his empire, and there is considerable evidence that the uniformity arrived at after the Reformation was not without its political purpose. Those who desire uniformity should remember that there are different types of agreement with the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Trinity, types which express themselves, for example, in the very exact terminology of the Preface for Trinity Sunday; or, on the other hand, in the mystic interpretation allowed to every hymn, and therefore to the Preface. As we have shown, the ancient and mediaeval precedent in this matter allowed many variations, so long as the general implication of the types of service used was of an orthodox tenor—that is, emphasised a high conception of the person of Christ and of the nature of God. Acceptance of the principle involved in alternatives would allow such

wide freedom in the rubrics of Morning and Evening Prayer that the prophets among us would be free to exercise the liberty of the spirit. A possible corollary of this is that rubrics would be considered as suggestions rather than as binding laws. As a matter of practice such they are at present in the minds of intelligent and loyal men. Many of the rubrics are liturgical Blue Laws and should be recognised as such.

It may take a generation for all who hold differing views to shake down together, but meanwhile all who have marked the spirit of the Church Assembly in its deliberations on Prayer Book Revision must acknowledge that there are among us men with eyes to see that the history of worship is one of development and that the principles of worship demand variety of expression.

At the time of writing, the bishops are deliberating on the recommendations of Prayer Book Revision. They will doubtless remember the opening words of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer :

> It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring) sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued : and those many times more and greater than the evils, that were intended to be remedied by such change : So on the other side, the particular Forms of Divine worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged ; it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.

It is not to be expected that in the first effort the bishops will publish the prophetic vision. The first duty of the rulers of the Church is to set the Church

in order. We may, therefore, expect to begin with a revision that is somewhat negative, a skeleton as it were. This framework for the body we should receive with thanks, and pray that upon it there may grow flesh and nerve. 'Son of man, speak unto these dry bones that they may live.'

At such a time it is invigorating to churchmen to see how (with one exception) every school of thought in the Church has placed an offering of liturgical enrichment at the discretion of the bishops.

The liturgical contributions are known, as usual, by the colours of the covers of the books.

The *Blue Book* is the result of the work of the official committee of Convocation and of the National Assembly.

The *Green Book* is a whole new Prayer Book. It may be called the contribution of the Priestly School. It is the scheme of the English Church Union, and includes much valuable enrichment and a number of important, if debatable, additional services, as well as definite alterations based on sound liturgical principles.

The *Grey Book* is the work of a group of men of all schools of thought. It may be called prophetic in character. It agrees with the *Blue* and *Green Books* in many places, but it takes a more free and fresh line than either, both in its arrangement and its alterations. It also is based on sound liturgical principles. The *Grey Book* Group definitely refused to allow compromise or thoughts of party consideration to influence them. They deliberately put away the temptation to consider what would be likely to be accepted by the Assembly. They were not out to make a new Prayer Book, only to serve as suggestors. The *Grey Book*, Pamphlet No. 1, states that they 'first and above all desired truth.'

The *Yellow Book* is the work of a group of members of the Alcuin Club. (The ordinary churchman little knows how deeply indebted the whole Church

is to the members of this Club for the lead they have given in the revival of worship.)

No one of these four groups wished to push aside the Book of Common Prayer. They all alike offered only an alternative to the existing Prayer Book. This policy, which had its origin in the Convocations, may not be ideal, even as a temporary expedient, which is all that is intended. 'But two cogent reasons, among others, justify it.' Writes Dr. Duncan Jones : 'First, this is the only way to be fair to the large number of those who desire no change. Second, many of those who desire changes would wish to make trial of them experimentally, before any of them are treated as final, or imposed : if they are to be only experimental, clearly it is best that meanwhile the Prayer Book should go on as it is. After the period of experiment has done its work the opportunity will arise for returning to uniformity of rite, so far as it proves possible or desirable.'

The divergences of the four books are not so great as they seem to be at first sight except in the canon of the office of Holy Communion.

The 'Grey' Canon alone of the various proposals before the Assembly received support from Evangelicals and Liberals as well as High Churchmen. It seeks to remove certain blemishes in our present Order which Anglican liturgists from the seventeenth century onward have recognised, and other Churches of our communion have sought to correct. But at the same time it deliberately sets out to confirm certain aspects of sacramental doctrine which the Evangelical tradition exists to maintain ; and its supporters claim that it is the expression of a spirit which looks for its standard of catholicity not only to the tradition which prevails in the Latin West, but also to the thought and experience of the whole Church, Eastern as well as Western, modern as well as ancient, Reformed as well as Orthodox or Roman.

Six questions will probably have to be asked and answered before a decision can be arrived at between the proposals for the great prayer of 'the canon.'

(1) Which canon represents most fully and exactly the teaching of the New Testament?

(2) Which conforms most closely in its construction to earlier forms of the Consecration Prayer as used, not only in the West but also in the East, before the influence of the Roman rite displaced other uses?

(3) Which precludes most effectively certain theories as to the mode and moment of consecration and the nature of Eucharistic sacrifices? Theories which were rejected by the Church of England at the Reformation and are not acceptable to great numbers of Anglicans to-day.

(4) Which places the greatest emphasis on the Priesthood of the laity?

(5) Which makes most clear the inseparable connexion between Communion and Sacrifice in the Eucharist?

(6) Which preserves the most valuable characteristics of our English Liturgy?

There are three places in the Communion Service where all the proposed revisions could be combined and improved—the Proper Prefaces, the Liturgical Anthems, and the sequence of readings for Epistle and Gospel. Here is room enough to provide worthy opportunities for variety and new life in the Communion Service without violating any sound principles of corporate worship. For instance, everyone knows the value of the Easter anthem: 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.'

There is no reason why every festival should not have its own 'anthem,' and every Sunday its Proper Preface duly acclaiming the Lord of Life as seen in the teaching of the day. This latter would involve the provision of a sequence of readings such as is proposed by Professor Barry, a sequence which gives a consistent presentation of the Revelation of God in Jesus

Christ, and the way of thought and life which should follow from it.

In this way, in the course of the Church's year, the worshipper will offer the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice in their relation to the modern world. The worship of the Eucharist will at once be a worthier expression of the spirit and teaching of our Lord, and in it the worshipper will present before God a fuller knowledge of God's gift, and the kind of life which is required from members of the Christian society.

IV

PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS

If the religious life of our day was not so full of business we should be excited beyond measure at the new possibilities that are being opened up to us in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. Take two illustrations. Bishop Frere in his Liturgical Psalter reminds the Church that sometimes psalms have been taken whole, sometimes parts of them only which have been found particularly appropriate.

Bishop Frere says: 'Continuous recitation was characteristic of monastic (or clerical) services: it was suitable to experts in devotion rather than to the average man. In the people's services the method of selection prevailed over that of recitation-in-course.

'The great exception is the English Prayer Book: and nowhere else in Christendom do ordinary lay-people attempt the task.

'The scheme of revision, which forms part of the Alternative Prayer Book, would make it permissible, on Sundays at any rate, to give up the principle of recitation-in-course for that of selection. We may hope that in time this option may prevail. But if the selective plan is adopted, it should be followed frankly; and the best parts should be selected to the exclusion of the less suitable.

'The Psalter is not uniformly suitable. Yet in the

scheme propounded for Sundays according to the Revised Prayer Book there seems to survive a hankering after the discarded ideal, taking the shape of an attempt to work in most of the psalms into the table, more or less equally.'

Psalms ought not necessarily to be taken whole. To this, of course, we have been accustomed in the occasional offices of the Book of Common Prayer. In Bishop Frere's book, parts are omitted where it seemed desirable ; or (more accurately speaking) in some cases only the part (or parts) of a psalm that seemed devotionally profitable have been included.

Then look at the fascinating advance that has been made in the hymn books of the Church. The last collection of published hymns, ' Songs of Praise,' is bound to make of our succeeding generations a hymn-singing people. There is so much in it that men can be proud to sing on any worthy occasion. If it be true that the spiritual life of a race is influenced far more by its hymns than by sermons, then there is indeed hope for a Church that encourages its children to love a quality of spiritual rhythm such as is given in ' Songs of Praise.'

V

UNREALITY IN WORSHIP

A very real trouble to the parochial clergyman is the constant danger of unreality in worship. He remembers how Jesus resented the homage of unreality when He walked the Syrian soil. He knows Jesus resents unreality when He finds it in England's Church. Jesus accepted the worship of the leper and the blind man, but He resented the worship of the young man who offered the lip-service cry ' Good Master.' The question has been asked—' Will the revision of the Prayer Book overcome this danger of unreality ?' That would be to expect too much of a form of service, a relatively small thing in such a

tremendous and vital realm as the spirit of worship. Forms of service are closely connected with the most interesting religious phenomena and with the highest moral sentiments, and, as we have seen, they have their place as the expression of the worshipping life ; but in the end these forms convey reality only when they assist in creating the best possible conditions whereby worshippers in a group can become aware that they are found by God and in this awareness break through to God in simple appreciation of the fellowship there is in Him. We know that an act of individual worship will liberate the whole man until by every measure of his intelligence the eternal spirit is enjoyed ; gates of new life are thrown open to him, and God is apprehended by him. Can this also be said of corporate worship ?

Teachers who have discarded the new Group Psychology say " yes," and proceed to offer suggestions as to how best to dispose the group mind to receive God, how to lead the group mind up to a ready state for moments of reception and for moments of expression.

There are not wanting pastors among us who are even now putting this claim of psychologists to the test. It will be a great gain to the community if the clergy are taught how they can discover the varying peculiar spiritual stimuli to which their own worshippers can make response. It is certain that God has provided such stimuli, and that it is His will that we should discover the several laws that govern them.

It is possible that the psychologist has as much to render to the Church on the subjective side of corporate worship as the theologian has to contribute on the more important objective aspect of worship.

Certain actual attempts to form a psychology of worship are in ill repute, and rightly so. The formal act of worship cannot be understood apart from the whole worshipping life. The unworshipping student can only make, as it were, a post-mortem examination of bodies who have been said to have worshipped.

The table of measures and weights in the pulsating life of worship, including its formal act, is only made known to us when we enter the mystic sanctuary of God.

In the Church of the future the minister will not concern himself with making the service popular, or even effective from the standpoint of intercessions; his concern will be with making it true. His care will be for the relating of his people to the worshipping life of the community, avoiding any of the so-called minor details which hinder the group from breaking through to God.

The aim of Church worship is God, 'for it is to God we long to get.'

VI

WORSHIP AND UNITY

The last indication that I will mention is that of the patient plodding at Church Unity which is going on in our day. The future of the worship of the Church of England cannot be thought of apart from Church unity. Church unity is more a question of ways of worship than anything else.

Freedom of liturgical use is an indispensable preliminary to Church unity. The Church unity of the future must entail, on the part of many communions within the Christian Church, the retention of their peculiar ways of worship: the Quaker being bereft of almost any form whatsoever; the Congregationalist determining for himself what form of service he shall follow; the Greek Church rich in forms beyond anything Anglican or Roman.

When there is a return to the primitive recognition of various alternative forms of service this wide variety of temperament will be free to recognise itself within one united Church, and then, alleluia, the Church of England will become a microcosm of the liberty that is in Christ Jesus.

THE CLERGY AND THEIR TRAINING

BY THE REV. B. K. CUNNINGHAM,
M.A., O.B.E.
(Principal of Westcott House, and Hon. Canon of Winchester)

SYNOPSIS

I. The priesthood of the laity. The idea of priesthood. The call to priesthood . . . . . pp. 73–81

II. The shortage of candidates. The causes of shortage. Social and financial considerations. The intellectual requirement. The training of the graduate candidate. The non-graduate candidate. Some criticisms. Conclusion . . . . . ,, 81–104

IV

THE CLERGY AND THEIR TRAINING

'EVERY community gets the priesthood it deserves' was the retort made, presumably on the principle of the offensive being the best form of the defensive, by a member of the recent Mission of Help in North India. The mess-room was filled with army officers of all ranks, whose experience of padres happened to have been unfortunate, and who were arguing vigorously from the particular to the general. When the outcry with which the remark was greeted had died down, the Missioner, disclaiming any intention of rudeness, challenged those present as to whether any of them had ever put before their respective younger generations, sons or godsons or nephews, the ministry of the Church as even a possible career ; if not, had they any right to complain that their padres were not of a kind similar to those boys ?

To apologise for the alleged ineffectiveness of the clergy on the ground that, after all is said and done, they only have the laity to draw upon, is not so cheap a rejoinder as might at first sight appear, for the priesthood of the ordained man is, at any rate from one point of view, representative of the priesthood of the whole Christian community.

I

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY

Perhaps the fundamental need of our time is a revival in the Church of England of the consciousness of its own corporate priesthood. The word has had grievous wrong done to it in history. The Roman

Church, by practically limiting the idea of priesthood to the order of the clergy, has deprived the laity of the sense of their privilege and responsibility as priests, while Protestantism has done a like injury by running away in panic from the idea, and even the word. Yet the New Testament writers do not shrink from it. St. Peter recalls and applies to the Christian community the phrase which had been used of the Jewish nation : ' Ye are a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God ' (1 Pet. ii. 5) ; and again, he speaks of them as ' an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession ' (1 Pet. ii. 9).

The writer to the Hebrews, after setting forth the glory of the priesthood of our Lord, speaks of Christian people as ' having boldness to enter into the Holy Place,' and thus by a startling picture brings home to them the truth that it was their privilege to do what in the older covenant could be done by priests alone (Heb. x. 19).

In the Apocalypse the redeemed sing praise to Him ' who made us to be (corporately) a Kingdom, and to be (individually) Priests unto His God and Father ' (Rev. i. 6, *cf.* v. 10 and xx. 6). The Apostolic Church was then, surely, conscious of itself as called to exercise a Christian priesthood in an unbelieving world.

And in our time the influence of the Church of a people to whom God has committed the responsibility of Empire would surely be deeper than it is, if the consciousness of the members of that Church was not the negative self-feeling of ' mere laymen,' but the positive assertion of themselves as ' Kings,' appointed to claim each his own sphere of life for the kingship of the Lord Christ, and as ' Priests ' through whom men are to be brought into fellowship with God.

There are, indeed, many devoted clergy who teach explicitly and directly the high dignity and responsibility of the ordained priest ; but this seems a singularly ill-advised method of approach to the subject, and for

three reasons. Firstly, because it is not the scriptural order ; the New Testament has a good deal to say on the priesthood of the whole Christian Church, but says little on the priesthood of the ordained minister. Secondly, because the British people instinctively dislike hearing any man praise his own calling, however sacred it may be ; the procedure is considered to savour of ' bad form '—that greatest condemnation, in an Englishman's judgment of value ! Thirdly, because there would be little difficulty in getting the Church laity to perceive and appreciate the priesthood of the padre, if only the clergy could persuade them to think more highly of their own priesthood.

II

THE IDEA OF PRIESTHOOD

What, then, is Priesthood in the broad sense of that much-abused word ? In an elusive but attractive book, ' The Epistle of Priesthood,' Dr. Nairne leads us on to the conclusion that, whenever any man is called ' to stand on the god-ward side ' in relation to others, there is priesthood ; thus the father is priest to his family ; the colonel to his regiment ; the elder workman to the boy who works under his directions ; the head of the business firm to all employed therein ; the doctor in a sick room ; the sister or nurse in a hospital ward ; the ' curate ' in his parish ; the king in his nation. ' All strong persons,' writes Dr. Nairne, ' exercise priesthood to weaker ones, though of course strength is not only bodily strength, and many of the most priestly lives are spent in sickness ' ; and of course we should add to this list of church workers exercising priesthood every lay Christian in relation to those who do not know God in Christ. It is the laymen and not the clergy, properly speaking, who should be our ' foreign missionaries.'

This is that natural priesthood which runs all through human society, a priesthood which one New

Testament writer describes, in a phrase conveying little to the English reader, as 'after the order of Melchizedek,' a priesthood of which our Lord Himself is the great exemplar. Its activities, then, cannot be other than reflections, at however great a distance, of His own priestly work—ever pouring itself out in loving service to men, in God's Name, and ever devoting itself to God in prayer and offering in their name.

'The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep,' that is the heart of the whole beautiful priestly activity; so it comes to pass that the only priesthood, whether lay or cleric, which repels men is that which is lacking in love; it is a contradiction of itself.

If priesthood be thought of as so comprehensive in character and so many-sided in activity, it is not surprising that the Christian Churches in their separation should have emphasised some of them one aspect, and some of them another, and have tended to lose a true sense of proportion; and this is just what appears to have happened. A fuller recognition of the fact should lead to a larger charity in regard to our several limitations, and a fuller appreciation of our varied emphasis in the training of men for priestly ministration. With this in mind it may be permissible to review, even with that element of exaggeration which inevitably belongs to generalisations, three leading conceptions of priesthood, with their corresponding limitations.

During the Great War one holding a high command in the armies in France, who was credited with the opinion that a good body of padres was worth an extra division, was inclined to qualify this praise in reference to the chaplains of the Roman Church. He recognised, indeed, that they were second to none in courage and devotion in ministering the sacraments to their own flock, but work on the recreative and educational side of the soldier's life they considered to be outside their sphere. The real ground of

criticism lay of course deeper ; the Roman Church tends to define its priesthood in terms of the exercise of functions which can only be validly performed by the ordained priest. It is in harmony with this conception that in the preparation of their candidates the teaching of Moral Theology, and of the science and art of dealing with souls, occupies a large proportion of time, and has been developed to a high degree of perfection.

When we consider the Presbyterian Church, on the other hand, it can hardly be denied that, at any rate till recent years, the duty of pastoral visitation in city parishes and of welfare work on behalf of those who dwell in slums, had been seriously neglected, and that now the ministry of the sacraments is not what might be expected in view of the strong sacramental teaching of its formularies. But throughout its history this Church has maintained a standard of preaching probably unequalled in other Churches, and Christendom owes it a big debt also for its contribution to Biblical scholarship. The Presbyterian Church has laid extreme emphasis on the prophetic aspect of the Ministry, and in its training colleges Homiletics are taught in theory and practice with very great thoroughness, and Biblical study is prolonged and thorough.

The critic of the Church of England might complain, and with truth, that its clergy cannot be compared with those of the Roman Church in professional knowledge of their peculiar work, and it will be admitted that, while the Church of England has produced a few great preachers in every generation, the general level of sermons is not up to the standard of the Presbyterian, either in solidity of teaching or in power of presentation. The emphasis here has been upon the pastoral office rather than upon the sacrificial or prophetic, though indeed the latter is strongly emphasised in our Prayer Book Ordinal. Correspondingly, the influence of the Church of England has been largely due to what may fairly be called the culture of

her clergy. For many generations previous to the Great War its Ministry had been drawn almost exclusively from the Public Schools and older Universities. These men may have been neither trained preachers nor expert priests, but they were pre-eminently 'English gentlemen in Holy Orders.'

Now it is easy to sneer at this, and the inadequacy of the description may be granted, yet beyond question there is something singularly effective in the quality of a 'gentleman,' and nowhere is that quality more surely discerned and responded to than by the poorest classes in our big towns or by the 'native' in the foreign field, whether it be China, India, or Melanesia. A sense of humour, rooted in a sense of proportion, a quickness of sympathy, a resolute refusal to take personal offence, and an innate courtesy which, as Bishop Francis Paget has defined it, consists in respect for the self-respect of others, are among those gifts of leadership which belong to the public-school tradition. When *noblesse oblige* is combined with personal devotion to our Lord and love of mankind for His sake, the resultant grace of character has, to a large extent, made up for deficiency in professional training or in theological learning. In the ministry of the Church of England more than in those others to which we have referred 'personality' has counted, and the past methods of 'training,' more amateur than even our present theological colleges, did succeed in some measure in bringing the man, enriched by all that England had given him, into closer fellowship with God through the devout study of the New Testament, and sent him forth to visit God's children that were scattered abroad. Life in touch with Him Who is Life passing into other lives in the daily pastoral visitation has been the crowning glory of our Ministry. After all, was not that the supreme way of the Incarnate Son of God?

But times are changing, and the sacrificial, the

prophetic, and the pastoral interpretations of priesthood cannot longer be held apart. In the priest of the future Church of England these aspects must reach some higher synthesis, as in the earthly life of Him Who is our great High Priest.

III

THE CALL TO PRIESTHOOD

Before passing, however, to consider the present situation, it may be encouraging to review some of the roads along which men are led to offer themselves for Holy Orders. We hear a great deal about the dearth of candidates ; we would do well also to wonder at the supply. It must surely take strong inducement to lead any man to a career which, on the face of it, involves considerable sacrifice of many of the good things of life—such as postponement of marriage, existence in drab lodgings, and amid even more drab surroundings—a career which has little to offer in financial reward or high place, and of which the caricature in *Punch* or the West-End stage represents the prevailing opinion of society.

Our Lord, we read, on becoming conscious of His call was ' driven *by the Spirit* into the wilderness to be tempted.' A theological college of some kind will ever be needful, if only to give men the opportunity to face up to, and whole-heartedly to accept, all that is involved in their vocation to Ministry. Thither, though it be very far from being a wilderness, they are led, in like manner to their Master, by the Spirit, to be tempted.

But how do men come to recognise their call ? To some there has been given a mystic experience of our Lord's demand upon them as vivid as any recorded in Scripture, but it is hardly so with the majority ; or again, here and there one is to be found who has entered the Ministry almost solely through the gate

of the intellect, finding in the revelation given in Christ the most tolerable solution to the problems with which life is beset ; but in the great majority of cases the approach, at any rate in its opening stages, has been along the line of call to service. If mystic experience may be interpreted as covering the reflection of Pascal 'Thou wouldst not be seeking me if Thou hadst not found me,' there has indeed been some such experience ; but the vision, as in the case of Moses and Isaiah, has been closely related to the needs of the age. Such men have heard the appeal of a world in need of what (as they begin to see) can only be supplied by Life in fellowship with God through Jesus Christ ; and to every nature, which is at the same time sympathetic and practical, the recognition of a need is a challenge to minister to it. Vision and appeal are met together, compassion and distress kiss one another ; in each is the activity of the Holy Spirit, and at the meeting-point of the two the Call comes. It must be so, for are not the two great realities in this vast universe the heart of God and the heart of man, and each is ever seeking the other.

It is, however, a mistake to think that the picture of the little child Samuel interprets the experience of any great number of men who find their way to Holy Orders in our time. The fact is few men ever *want* to be ordained, but God's answer to the excellent reasons which they put forward for not doing the work He has for them to do is generally none other than the continuous pressure of His will. The 'Hound of Heaven' pursues, and men do not seem able to escape ; and, what is more, in their best moments they do not want to escape. Only after they have surrendered, and then step by step, do they learn that His Name is Love.

No one who is privileged to minister to men on the threshold of ordination can be really fearful, for he knows from experience that though our methods may be at fault, our outlook too narrow, and we ourselves

loading the priesthood with a heavy disparagement, God moves wondrously in the hearts of men, and will carry forward His purpose, though it may be in ways that are to us strange and unexpected.

IV

THE SHORTAGE OF CANDIDATES

Yet there is indeed ground for challenging our present methods in regard both to the supply and the training of candidates for Holy Orders, for the numbers are seriously deficient ; though there has never been a time when the clergy were not severely criticised, we have now taken to criticising ourselves.

The question of supply has been recently considered by a strong and representative Committee appointed by our two Archbishops, and their Report was published in 1925.

Statistics are notoriously slippery things, and to tread their maze in truth and wisdom requires expert knowledge. Some facts and considerations, however, appear to be obvious. From 1877 till 1886 the numbers rose steadily, and in 1886 it reached 814, a figure which has never since been touched. In regard to recent years the numbers ordained in the Provinces of Canterbury and York were as follows : in 1923 the number was 463, in 1924 it was 436, and in 1925 it was 370. The 1923 figure, in spite of the fact that the inflow of Army 'Service candidates,' assisted from Central Funds, was then at its height, was 70 fewer than the lowest point reached during the 10 years previous to the War.

The figures also show that, whereas during the years 1880–1911 the Church was ordaining on an average 700 men a year in England, we are now (if we set aside the Service candidates, who properly belong to the period of War) ordaining on an average below 300.

One who has given a good deal of thought and care to the subject writes : 'Another startling fact is that we have now about the same number of clergy in England as there were in 1880, whereas the population is half as great again, say from 25 millions to 38 millions. This fact implies that if we want to have as many clergy relative to population in England today as there were in 1881, it would be necessary to "lay hands suddenly" on anything from 7,000 to 9,000 men!' And he again writes, 'If the number of ordinands were to continue at 400 a year (and the wastage of clergy remain at its present figure), I do not see how we could staff over 12,000 benefices in 1940.' It is not pretended that these somewhat disconnected facts and figures do in themselves lead to clearly defined conclusions, but they give some indication of the seriousness of the position.

It is possible to argue that a very great reduction in the numbers of our ordained men would be for the Church of England a blessing in disguise, forcing upon us a revolution in our whole administration and compelling the laity to take over many duties which now fall to the work of the ordained priest. Those who claim (surely with some presumption as to knowledge of the ways of God) that the only answer to 'the World Call' is to be measured in terms of the number of young ordained men who go overseas these next few years, must reckon with the facts, for the whole field is one. Sacrifice is, indeed, ever fruitful, but the days are gone when there can be said to be more 'sacrifice' involved in going to Delhi or Pekin or Africa than to a working-class district of Sheffield or Manchester.

We have no right, however, to assume that this serious decline in the number of ordination candidates is the Will of God, and not due to our own grievous faults.

V

THE CAUSES OF SHORTAGE

The causes of it are carefully reviewed in the Committee's Report, and our present purpose is rather to consider to what extent those causes are likely to operate in the future.

There is certainly, as the Committee points out, a good deal of misconception as to the work of the clergy ; to many of the younger generation it seems to consist in taking numberless services in church, preaching and ministering generally to a very limited group of people, while vast numbers of men and women of good-will remain 'outside,' untouched by the clergy or by Church organisation ; consequently the ordained life does not impress them as being the great adventure for God that it might be, and in many cases is, and the work of the parson does not seem to be 'a man's job.' As alternatives to the ministry of the Church, the tasks of Empire, and modern civilisation in general, offer a variety of openings for careers of useful service ; masterships in public schools and in secondary schools appeal to many of the best type ; the industrial world demands men who will train themselves for the management of labour ; and many of the social duties which used to be the concern of the parson have now been taken over by laymen ; consequently, men with an instinct for 'pastoral work,' who in former times would have naturally looked to the ministry of the Church, are finding other spheres of useful service which make less demand on the spiritual side of life.

These developments are, of course, to be welcomed. 'They are,' as the Report truly says, 'a proof not of the Church's failure, but of its success in Christianising the national ideals.' The question is, will they continue to be for many men a substitute for the ordained

life? We think not. Again and again, in experience, the rock on which excellent social and educational schemes of reform have made shipwreck has been failure in character; but character can only be securely and intelligently built upon the basis of belief in God. Consequently the priest, standing as he does for 'things pertaining to God,' will be recognised as being the truly radical reformer of the ills which beset our national life.

As to prevailing misconceptions, the responsibility, and indeed the remedy, lies in large degree with us clergy individually. Too often we appear to make "Religion" our god, instead of God our religion, hence we fail either to hallow, or make beautiful to others, His Name. At the same time it must be admitted that our Church has hitherto been too slow to welcome 'diversities of ministrations' in its priesthood. With the exceptions of the Padre-Don and the Schoolmaster-Padre there has been hardly any scope for the man who would serve God in the ordained life in some special sphere of service, but cannot see himself being happy in the daily round of a parish priest. New forms of specialised ministry, such as Toc H. chaplaincies and those of the I.C.F., are therefore to be welcomed.

It may be that these and like special ministries which cut across our parochial system have a big future before them, and will serve to widen the appeal of the ordained life. This seems the place, however, to add that the specialist, even the Schoolmaster-Padre, will surely be better fitted for his work if he first of all accepts apprenticeship as a 'general practitioner' in an English parish, and learns in that unrivalled school of character to walk humbly with God and to acquaint himself with the many-sidedness of the ordained life.

In many Conferences of those who had a right to speak on the subject, resolutions have been passed in regard to the unsatisfactory character of the Thirty-

nine Articles as a statement to which even a general assent should be required, and the Report wisely draws attention to the fact. On the other hand most people will agree with the Archbishops' Committee that 'some form of assent is necessary, and that this assent should be given explicitly to the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith, and, further, to that presentment of faith and worship the main principles of which are now set forth in the Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal.'

The atmosphere of unreality which at present is felt in regard to this assent will, we trust, be cleared when the Commission, which has now been meeting for some years on the extent of existing doctrinal agreement within the Church of England, has made its report.

Meanwhile, it should be more generally understood that men are *not* called upon to signify assent 'to all and each of the Articles,' as was the case up till 1865, and, further, that the responsibility of deciding whether the doubts and difficulties which a man may have are, or are not, compatible with ordination, rests not upon the candidate, but upon the ordaining Bishop, who is acting in the matter as representative of the Church. The candidate's sole responsibility is to be honest in the expression of his doubt. Many have been surprised at the sympathy and breadth of vision with which their misgivings have been met.

These are some of the considerations of a special kind, which have made it more difficult than need be for men to see their way to offering themselves for ordination; but the supply of the clergy in every age is really related to the prevailing tone of the whole Church. Among the younger generation of our time there is a remarkable interest in religion; the attendance at, and attention to, the Missions held triennially in Cambridge since the War have afforded unmistak-

able proof of this ; but coupled with this individual interest there runs the conviction that each man's religion is his own affair, and concerns only himself and God. Hence very many men remain in the outer courts, and fail to recognise responsibility in regard to any corporate expression of the Christian faith ; behind all this, as schoolmasters testify, there is very serious decay of religion in the home-life of the country, and the 'atmosphere' in which the boy grows up is far from suggesting a life consecrated to Christ. The writer knows from experience that many a man who comes forward for ordination in these days, does so in the face of discouragement, and even of active opposition, in the home circle. One such, on breaking the news to his father, a business man and a 'churchman,' was met with the answer 'My boy, if you are ordained it will be the crowning disappointment of my life.' In another case a candidate was offered a thousand pounds down if he would throw over ordination and enter business. These are extreme cases, but they are not isolated.

The supply of candidates for the Ministry is ultimately dependent on the degree of self-consecration in the whole Church. Those of us who believe that the signs of our times point to an approaching 'break-through' of the Kingdom of God look to the future with quiet confidence.

VI

SOCIAL AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The difficulties of a financial kind call for separate consideration, because they at once raise the very big question of the social class from which the Ministry of the Church will, in the future, be mainly recruited. If the Church of England is prepared to welcome and to train free of charge men of every social grade, then there is no lack whatever of the supply of ordination candidates. The Wardens of such places as Kelham

and Mirfield, which draw their men from all ranks of society, tell us that applications are received, literally by hundreds, every year. What is the Church going to do about it ?

There can be no doubt that, in the abstract, neither financial nor social advantages should be deemed qualifications for the Ministry, nor can it be contended that poverty precludes from Ministerial service, or that God confines the vocation to the Priesthood to one rank of the social order.

Reviewing past history, the evidence in regard to the social class from which the Church has drawn its clergy is not conclusive. The self-conscious humility with which George Herbert decided to take Orders implies that the step was then unusual with men of his social standing ; Andrews and Laud and other great Caroline divines were men of more humble parentage. In the eighteenth century the gap between the different classes of the clergy was far wider than it is to-day. Of the 157 men who rose to the episcopate in that century, twenty-two (that is, 14 per cent.) had titles in their own right (the proportion increases towards the end of the century), the rest appear to have been drawn from the middle classes, including in that term small tradesmen and small farmers. While the distinction between the upper and the upper-middle class was much more marked than it is to-day, the tradesman was not socially distinguished from the professional man, and there was nothing remarkable in the fact that, of the brothers Barrow, one was a linen-draper and the other a bishop, nor was it regarded as extraordinary for a barber's son, like Jeremy Taylor, to reach the episcopate.

At the other end of the clerical scale were the curates, of whom many lived and died without the slightest prospect of rising above the position of a stipendiary curate, and for whom the regular stipend was £30 a year ; ' the common fee for a sermon was a shilling

and a dinner, for reading prayers twopence and a cup of coffee.' It is not surprising that many of them had to supplement their pittances by manual labour, often of a menial kind, and the implication is that a considerable number must have been drawn from the peasant class.

It was very rare for any Bishop to confer Orders on a man who was not a graduate of Cambridge or Oxford ; it should, however, be borne in mind that men of humble origin went up to the University as 'poor scholars' or servitors ; they did the menial work for the fellow-commoners, and picked up what learning they could. A University education was not necessarily a social hall-mark.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century we read that 'the ranks of the clerical body were recruited more frequently from men of standing, means, and education, and much less often from the lower grades of society.'

In the nineteenth century the Ministry had, for good or ill, been practically confined to one social class, with the result that a long-established prejudice in favour of that particular class had been created, while clergy drawn from the artisan classes were apt to be regarded, both by their own people and by other ranks, somewhat critically.

Then came the War, and the Church, through the Archbishop, made a big venture in letting it be known that men of every rank or social grade, provided that they could qualify in the moral and intellectual requirements, and believed they were called by God to the Ministry, would be received as candidates, and that the Church would accept financial responsibility for their training. This gave rise to the Test School, first in France and afterwards at Knutsford.

Humanly speaking, it was this venture of faith which saved the Church from serious disaster ; for the period 1921–24, during which the influence of the

'Service Candidates Scheme' was most felt, out of 1,637 men ordained, no fewer than 660 (or more than 40 per cent.) were Service candidates, receiving financial aid from the central funds of the Church.

Does the Church intend to keep the door to the Ministry as widely open in the future?

It may fairly be argued that the restriction of the Ministry in the nineteenth century was not exclusively a social question, but to a great extent an educational one; boys from poorer homes had not then the opportunities which the wide extension of Secondary and University education in recent years has thrown open to them. Higher education may now be said to be within the reach of promising boys from all ranks of the community, whose ability is discovered in time, and for whom financial help is forthcoming.

The problem becomes then largely one of finance and of training.

The Church of England appears to stand alone among the communities in not providing full financial assistance for all suitable candidates for its Ministry. In an interesting Appendix to the Report of the 1908 Committee, particulars of thirty-six colleges—Roman, Free Church and Presbyterian—were given, and from these it appears that, with the exception of Westminster (Presbyterian), of which the fees then were £45 a year, no college charged its students more than £15 a year, and in the great majority the education was entirely free, the colleges being maintained either by endowment or subscriptions or both.

It is a hopeful sign for the future of our Church Ministry that the Central Board of Finance recognises that the training of ordination candidates must be one of the first charges upon its funds, and is courageously undertaking the responsibility to the extent of the limited money available.

On the other hand, ordination candidates funds organised in the interests of a particular school of

thought within the Church should be most strongly deprecated. They tend to harden and make permanent our party divisions. Some of these trusts go so far as to claim, and to exercise the right, to dictate the college to which the receivers of their grants shall go, and the parish in which they shall serve their diaconate. This brings compulsion to bear upon the candidate that he will not alter his views, nor grow in breadth of outlook, in the course of his theological studies; the pressure on the conscience of any man who finds himself in doubt whether he is being true to the terms on which he received his grant is most hurtful and most unfair.

By all means let there be special funds, but let these use the recognised official organisation of the Church —the Rural Deanery, the Diocese, the Central Authority. In experience the larger unit is found to work more efficiently.

VII

THE INTELLECTUAL REQUIREMENT

With the widening of the avenues to ordination there must be a correspondingly increased supervision at the gate. The question of more thorough training becomes of vital importance.

When we pass to consider this question, it can at least be claimed that as regards the intellectual requirement there has been some advance in recent years.

Until 1919 it had been customary in the Church of England for each Bishop to conduct through his examining chaplains his own diocesan examination; this, of course, led in practice to a variety of standard which was in every way harmful. Moreover, the personality of the candidate was liable to count for too much. 'You only have to be sufficiently-severely wounded,' said one such with a merry laugh, 'and any Bishop will accept you,' and in pre-War years the University athlete might be the equivalent of the

1918 'severely-wounded.' That has been changed, and almost every Bishop now accepts what is termed 'the General Ordination Examination,' conducted by an outside body of examiners, as the sufficient intellectual test. The reasonable claim that a Bishop should know something of his own candidates is met by his right to review the papers done in this examination, and by a further 'Bishop's examination,' which in every up-to-date diocese differs in character and purpose from the 'G.O.E.' and aims rather at testing the candidate's own thoughtfulness, personal belief and ability to use his knowledge for pastoral purposes.

The General Examination not only introduces some degree of uniformity in standard, but is in itself broader in scope than the former diocesan examinations.

Four papers are assigned to the knowledge of Scripture; 'Christian Doctrine' takes the place of 'The Thirty-nine Articles.' 'Christian Worship' covers a wider field than the pre-War paper on 'The Prayer Book'; and whereas in old days the candidate was supposed to know something of Church history up till A.D. 451, and something of the history of the Church of England, as though the action of the Spirit was confined within these limits, the study of Church history is now made continuous. A significant addition to the subjects required is one which is termed, somewhat ambiguously, 'Christian Morals.' It would be interesting to consider whether there is any connexion between this change of emphasis in the course of studies and certain regrettable tendencies, which are noticeable in some of the younger clergy, to think more lightly of loyalty to the Church of England *as such*, but the widening of the field of study ought, of course, to make for broader outlook and greater general intelligence. The obvious criticisms are, firstly, that such a course certainly demands a longer period of

study than one year, and secondly, that no place is found for the science and art of preaching, the principles and practice of education, the psychology of religion, social problems, or comparative religion.

On the other hand, in these days, when a man can take first-class honours in his University in history or natural science or other subject with only the smattering of Latin required to pass 'Little-go' or 'Smalls,' and no knowledge whatever of Greek, is it not rather pedantic to require from all candidates some knowledge both of Greek and Latin in the ordination course? Few men who begin learning the Greek alphabet in their post-graduate year will gain much value from their Greek Testament, though they will consume a considerable amount of time and probably meet with much discouragement. The Heads of Theological Colleges have already passed resolutions asking that only *one* foreign language be made compulsory, and suggesting that those who do not take both Latin and Greek should be required to offer some of the subsidiary subjects, to which reference has been made. It is greatly to be hoped that the authorities will take a big view of the matter.

As regards Homiletics and the science and art of education, the theological colleges can only touch the fringe of these subjects in the limited time available; but it should be borne in mind that, in theory at any rate, a man's diaconate forms part of his training, and it is to be hoped that the Bishops in future years will insist on this being so in practice. The Diocese of Liverpool is leading the way by appointing a member of the Cathedral staff to be responsible for special lectures to the men newly ordained, and for supervising their further theological reading; in some other dioceses arrangements are being made for attendance of the younger clergy at 'weeks' on Sunday School methods and child psychology, and for the supervision of their sermon-writing.

VIII

THE TRAINING OF THE GRADUATE CANDIDATE

Such being in outline the required theological course, what is the best method of approach? It cannot be said that the Church has been indifferent to this subject. Independently of the attention which has been given to it in the Houses of Convocation, and at Conferences of Principals, the Archbishop in 1908 appointed a Committee of Enquiry under the Chairmanship of Dr. Furneaux, then Dean of Winchester, and its report is of great interest; while in 1917 one of the five 'Archbishop's Committees' dealt with 'The Teaching Office of the Church'; and an important section of that report is concerned with the training of the clergy before and after ordination.

Advice is already ahead of action, and the Church is still experimenting along several lines.

There are, no doubt, many good people who would prefer that one uniform method of training should be enjoined for all, and that the choice of a man's first parish, his call to, and recall from, overseas work should be controlled by a central authority. There may be a good deal to be said for that, there is one thing to be said against it—it is not our English way, and the Church in this, as in so many other respects, reflects the characteristics of our race.

The training of what are called 'graduate' and 'non-graduate' candidates presents a different set of problems and should be considered separately.

'Graduate' candidates include those who can provide from their own resources for their education and training, together with those who are socially on the same level, though they may have required financial assistance from other sources; for this class of candidate education has followed the usual course of preparatory school, public or secondary school, and

one of the older universities, to be succeeded by a short period of special training at a theological college.

The main problem in regard to candidates of this type is whether or not it is advisable that the whole of the training, subsequent to school, should be conducted at the Universities. The Archbishop's Committee was equally divided on this point, and the two sides of the question are stated with great clearness by Bishop Headlam and Bishop Gore respectively in two appendices to the report.

The advantages which men of this type gain by residence at Oxford or Cambridge are beyond dispute ; opportunities of a wider outlook, contact with leaders of thought, and intercourse with other men preparing for various professions, combine to provide an education which can scarcely be obtained elsewhere.

These Universities, however, do not provide, nor do they pretend to provide, a professional training for Holy Orders. They are places of higher education, rather than of especially religious education. Their function is to receive, augment, and transmit knowledge, even as the function of the colleges within them is to form character. In the words of a Canterbury Convocation Report, ' the real function of the University teaching of the Theological Faculty will always be misunderstood unless it is distinctly realised that a Board of Theological Studies is an academic body, and not the servant of the Church. It is responsible to the University and not to the Episcopate.' If we take theology to be the scientific study of the answer and application of Christian faith to the problems of life, the Universities are not ' Schools of Theology,' though they can and do provide the necessary materials for sound theology—criticism, history and sources.

A certain professor, in view of changes which are contemplated in the theological faculty, exclaimed with an air of mingled protest and resignation, ' It might come to our having to teach ! ' and when the person

addressed remarked that this is what he supposed the worthy professor had been doing for many years, he was assured that the real work of a divinity professor was research.

It is significant that two great educational authorities, Dr. Westcott at Cambridge in 1882 and Dr. Headlam at a later date at Oxford, planned a scheme of study and devotional life which would not necessitate the withdrawal of ordination candidates from their university colleges, and in each case the original proposals have, in the light of experience, been materially modified. 'The Post-graduate Ordination Courses,' which are regarded by the Episcopate as the equivalent to the General Ordination Examination, now require that those who take these courses shall reside, for, at any rate, part of their study, in one or other of the theological colleges in Oxford or Cambridge.

These theological colleges in the Universities are probably passing through a transition stage; at present they are very like any other theological college. They maintain their own traditions and value highly their corporate and devotional life, and they do not confine membership to men who have taken high honour degrees, consequently while they have the 'experts' who derive great profit from attendance at University lectures, they also have men who have read some other subject for their degree, and are approaching theology for the first time. In University lectures the latter, unless they are of marked intellectual capacity, are apt to lose their bearings; there are so many trees to be critically examined that they never obtain any view of the wood. They need first to be given a view of theology as a coherent whole, as it is important that men should learn to appreciate before they begin to criticise. Consequently the less academic lectures given in a theological college are more likely to meet their immediate need.

The theological colleges at Oxford and Cambridge

stand in a favoured position as regards numbers, for few healthy-minded undergraduates know anything whatever about theological colleges and normally give 'first refusal' to the places at their door. Moreover, the members of these colleges do contribute much to the religious life of the University, and they may be unconsciously the Church's best recruiting agents for the Ministry. On the other side it is argued that this is not the function of men preparing for ordination, and they would have better chance of learning self-discipline and habits of devotional study away from the distractions of a University town.

It is, however, not unlikely that in future years the theological colleges in the Universities will be the nucleus of more fully equipped Anglican 'Schools of Theology,' and they would in this capacity be welcomed by the Universities. If that time should come and these colleges be confined to scholars and research students, we may express the hope that they will commend themselves to the undergraduate world by being, not only learned, but also human and virile and attractive, and that their corporate and devotional life will be as strong and as kindly as it is in our day.

Whether ordination candidates of the graduate type go to a theological college within or apart from the University, it is, however, of great importance that they should, wherever possible, gain some wider experience of life.

With picturesque exaggeration Mr. Compton Mackenzie has written : 'I am tempted to wonder whether it much matters what a man is taught so long as he meets enough men who have been taught something else.' What can the man whose experience has been limited to school and university and theological college possibly know of the outlook of those to whom he will later be expected to present the Christian religion ? The theological lecturer may, indeed, put up men of straw and knock them down, but it is not

a game that has much reality in it, and if the lecturer does not suspect his own honesty, probably his audience does. What is required is some peace-time equivalent to war experience in this respect ; for the Service candidate was enabled to look at life through the eyes of those with whom he lived and worked, and so to understand better his fellow-men. Private tutorships, unless accompanied by foreign travel, are worse than useless ; masterships in preparatory schools do little to widen a man's experience. Other openings are, however, now available—the Missionary Council is now acting as a clearing-house for offers of short service overseas, and missionary colleges in India and elsewhere are crying out for men who will give them three years of service ; the Missions to Seamen can generally make use of a good man in some seaport at home or on the Continent, and the Borstal Schools and various forms of welfare work have occasional vacancies. These openings provide a man with sufficient for his upkeep while in service, and it would be a real gain if in university settlements also, and other centres of social service, provision could be made by which suitable men might be allowed to serve without having to pay for board and lodging, which few of them can afford to do. Experience shows that the man who comes to his theological college after a period of short service in any such field, brings with him a wider sympathy and a better sense of proportion, and (what is of so great importance in study) he has some idea as to what he wants to find in his reading ; moreover, if his experience has been in work overseas, he has acquired, by ways less arduous and more effective than the reading of much missionary literature, what may be termed ' the missionary mind.'

There is one other point which should be referred to before we pass from the preparation of the graduate type of candidate. All the Committees and Conferences which have recently dealt with the subject of

training for the ministry have agreed in urging the necessity of the post-graduate course in theology being extended to two years. A glance at the range of subjects which have to be covered is sufficient to show the necessity of this extension in most cases. But here again we must be careful not to allow ourselves to be carried away by sweeping generalisations. Two years of self-culture must inevitably be a trying experience for men who feel that their primary duty is to cultivate an 'enthusiasm for humanity.' Moreover, there is a certain type of candidate who will never make a theologian, however long his course may be; the extended period may possibly spoil what he has to offer, whereas one year or eighteen months is sufficient to introduce him to devotional habits of life, give him some insight into what is required of him in the study of Scripture and for the teaching of Confirmation classes; and, provided it sends him out aware of how little he knows, and sufficiently humble to be prepared to go on learning, he will 'make good.' It is easy to scoff at such 'amateurs' in their profession, but when we consider the very great service which has been rendered, and is still being rendered to the Church by Dean Vaughan's 'Doves,' the Bishop Auckland Brotherhood, and the members of Bishop's Hostel, Farnham, one cannot but conclude that there will always be men for whom the shorter period is preferable, and that a rule of two years of theoretical study should not be too rigidly enforced—or at least that it should admit of some period of practical work in a college mission or university settlement.

Such men, however, must be 'exceptional cases'; the general standard of intelligence is higher than used to be the case, and the laity have a right to expect that the priest shall be as adequately equipped in his profession as are the doctor and the lawyer in theirs. This certainly for most men requires at least two years of specialised study.

IX

THE NON-GRADUATE CANDIDATE

The distinctive problems in connexion with 'non-graduate' candidates, by which are meant those who come from less cultivated homes and with fewer social advantages, are, firstly, how best to provide not only theology, but the higher education which is needful if we are to avoid a double standard in our ministry; and, secondly, the age at which such men should be 'recruited.'

At present, candidates of this type are generally men who left their elementary school at the usual age and passed into business or industry. They can be sent to 'Knutsford' (now, through the generosity of Mr. H. Gladstone, being established in Hawarden Rectory). This is not a theological college but a test school, where it can be discovered whether the candidate is likely to come up to the matriculation standard, and where, incidentally, he can gain a great deal of what we mean by the 'public school spirit,' and in surroundings which are spiritually helpful. After this, he can either proceed to a university degree and carry on as a graduate candidate, or put in three years at a 'non-graduate' or 'mixed' theological college. The Archbishops' Committee was equally divided on the question whether a degree should be insisted upon in the case of all candidates. It may be strongly argued that a changed situation is arising through the foundation and growth of new universities in all parts of the country. Even in those which have no theological faculty the anti-ecclesiastical spirit which characterised them in their first stages is dying down, and the Church policy should now be to establish, as opportunity offers, theological hostels in connexion with these; and in places where such hostels already exist, to strengthen them in every possible way. By such action the Church would, moreover, do something to

introduce a spiritual element into the rather hard materialism of these centres of learning, which will, beyond doubt, make their influence increasingly felt in the life of England.

As matters stand, Church funds seldom admit of accepting non-graduate candidates under twenty, by which time the boy, if he has been keen and capable, is beginning to settle down into his profession, and it is a serious adventure for him to give it up for a new and quite different life. No doubt brilliant successes have often come from second choice ; an early training in another direction may be a valuable experience, but it is surely preferable that a man should give his whole time from the first to preparation for his life's work ; lawyers are not first sent into the army, or soldiers to a theological college. By recruiting at so late an age the Church loses many whose first love might have been at its service, as well as the irreplaceable years during which the groundwork of a sound general education might have been laid.

The Report of the 1908 Committee suggested that the Church would do wisely to recruit for the ministry at the age when boys pass from primary education. Of course, this would not involve any pledging of the lad, it only means that he will be kept along an educational road which qualifies for ministerial service, and if in the end he withdraws, or the Church regards him as unsuitable, he would have had the advantage of sound general education at a secondary school. It is significant that the Roman Church in England provides a free training at a secondary school for all recruits for its ministry, demanding no pledge and prepared for withdrawal at any time up to the age of admission to the subdiaconate, namely twenty-two.

Any such scheme on our part would, of course, entail a very large financial backing ; the only thing of the kind at present to be found in the Church of England is 'Kelham,' but this is the wonderful

creation of an educational genius, and no Church can afford to sit still and wait for a succession of Father Kellys !

X

SOME CRITICISMS

The whole theological college system has been recently subjected to severe criticism. It is accused of being responsible for the maintenance and intensity of party spirit, for the widening gap between clergy and laity, and for the production of that distressing person which, if not newly created, has been newly named a 'spike.' If such criticism is true to fact, then indeed the Church of the future will do wisely to abolish, root and branch, its theological colleges.

The 'spike' is to be found in every school of thought, characterised by intense and narrow conviction. He is generally a man of exclusively religious interests who has mixed very little, except with those of his own type. He is the product of defective education. He comes to his theological college with fixed ideas and he takes only just what confirms them, and nothing else. He does untold harm to the cause of true religion, and by his want of charity tends to obscure the very truth he would commend, but it is not fair to put him down as the product of the theological college.

That each college has its own tradition and 'atmosphere' is certainly true. Could there be any corporate life without it ? But it is also true that, with the possible exception of one or two colleges at either extreme, men of varying churchmanship and outlook are not only tolerated but welcome, and find themselves free to develop along their own line of thought and action. The 'common life' of a theological college is a very intense and beautiful thing ; it should also be a very comprehensive thing, because 'common life' is only another way of describing 'the

fellowship of the Holy Spirit.' Where men realise that they share with one another an experience of Christ as their Lord and Saviour, and also are conscious of being called to a service which is demanding of them their all, they are thereby drawn into a fellowship so deep that it can easily be tolerant of differences.

Social and cultural differences form barriers far more difficult to surmount. A non-graduate student of the best type remarked to the writer that the Public Schools were the finest trade union he had ever struck, but that they had all the limitations of a trade union. This remark might be countered by that of a Public School man whose distress was that he could find 'nothing in common with those other fellows except religion, and one cannot talk religion all day'! Toc H. and 'mixed' theological colleges are doing a real service in so far as they succeed in helping their members to break down these barriers.

The criticism voiced by Dr. Headlam is more serious. 'The laity,' he writes, 'expect and desire that the clergy should be really good men, but they are only irritated when they find that the chief result of their training is to give them a fashion of religion different from that of their fellow-countrymen. The religious habits of the English laity are often old-fashioned, but they are genuine and sincere. The future clergy should learn, above all, to understand and sympathise with them, but often they seem rather to adopt towards them an attitude of spiritual superiority and to alienate them by religious practices which they do not understand.'

This is, of course, deplorable, but the fault is primarily a fault of character, and cannot be attributed entirely to the 'spiritual training' which men receive in their colleges. It is true that many a man at his theological college learns for the first time the meaning of worship—a lesson surely needful to be learnt by every clergyman. This spirit of worship is with great

difficulty taught to, or caught by, the English temperament, and is apt to puzzle and irritate, even when presented in reserved and manly fashion. On the other hand, the challenge conveyed in Dr. Headlam's criticism cannot lightly be disregarded.

The authorities in our theological colleges must face the question whether their system of training does not tend to exaggerate those affected mannerisms in the conduct of divine worship which are so repellent to the more manly element in an English congregation.

XI

CONCLUSION

All discussions as to the supply and training alike of 'graduate' and non-graduate candidates must have as their one aim to secure not necessarily large numbers of men for ordination but men of the right sort. Every one would echo the aspiration of the legendary country yokel: 'From midling parsons, good Lord deliver us.' While, however, the right man is easily recognised, he is not easily defined; the definition certainly cannot be given in terms of ecclesiastical colour, social status, or even of piety—we all probably know 'right ones' and 'wrong ones' in every grade of these categories—but it would have to include sincerity, unselfconsciousness, and friendliness, and the 'half-baked' could find no admission.

Anyone who attempts to look forward into the future of the Church of England finds himself beset with uncertainties. Will the Church, which in the past has played so large a part in the shaping of England's history and in the moulding of English character, continue to make its influence felt amid the new and complex forces which are already at work in our time? Will it be able to call out and enlist in active service the real, though often inarticulate,

religious instinct which is so characteristic of the English race ?

In this essay we have tried to review some of the problems which confront the Church to-day ; few conclusions have been reached, for the questions raised do not admit of ready or immediate solutions. One thing, however, is certain—if the Church of England is to continue to influence the national life it must aim, both in the selection of candidates and in its system of training, at the production of men not only adequately equipped with technical knowledge but with a wide outlook on life and a large sympathy with their fellows, born of personal experience of the difficulties which beset them.

Thus it must strive to bring into its service the best of our English manhood. For in ordination God works, as in all else, not magically by the overthrow of the natural, but sacramentally by the raising of the natural to higher power, that it may better answer to the purposes of the Spirit. The more real the man, the better the priest ; the ' human parson ' is no contradiction in terms, for he alone, in the future as in the past, can help his fellow-man and glorify God.

THE NEW CO-OPERATION

BY LT.-COLONEL R. E. MARTIN, M.A., C.M.G.

SYNOPSIS

The National Assembly of the Church of England briefly described and its representative character and importance shown . . . . . pp. 107–115

I. Man-power of the Church. The shortage of clergy and what is being done to remedy it . . . . . ,, 115–120

II. The Material Resources of the Church. Some aspects of Church finance considered . . . . . ,, 120–127

V

THE NEW CO-OPERATION

ANY forecast of the work which awaits the Church of England in the present century would plainly be incomplete without some reference to the means through which she is able to express her needs and give effect to her convictions. The need for such reference becomes obvious when it is remembered that, since at the end of 1919 the Royal Assent was given to the Enabling Bill, the Church has become possessed for the first time of an organisation, representative of the clergy and the laity, in a degree never before approached, and having a definite place in the nation's life. The calling into being of that organisation and the work done by it during the past seven years have made it possible for the Church to apply herself, with some prospect of success, to the task of adapting her machinery to the conditions under which her work has nowadays to be done.

It is perhaps worthy of remark that, like most English institutions, the National Assembly of the Church of England is the outcome of a process of development. It is now some seventy years since the Convocations of Canterbury and York were revived, as the bodies representative of the clergy. In 1886 the laity were for the first time formally associated with the central Councils of the Church, by the formation of the Canterbury House of Laymen, followed soon afterwards by the corresponding body in the northern province. These bodies, composed of laymen elected by the Diocesan Conferences, were purely voluntary and consultative. In 1896 a

further advance was effected by the holding of a joint session of the two Convocations with the Houses of Laymen, and this was followed a few years later by the formation of the Representative Church Council, composed of the same elements but operating under a definite constitution. In 1913 the Council petitioned the Archbishops for the appointment of a Committee 'to enquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of the Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion.' It is to the report of this Committee, considered and amended by the Representative Church Council itself, that the Church Assembly owes its origin. In May 1919 the Convocations presented an Address to the Crown, recommending that legislation should be undertaken for the establishment of a National Assembly of the Church of England, with a Constitution based upon that report. As a result of this the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Bill was introduced into Parliament : it passed through both Houses by overwhelming majorities and two days before Christmas it became law.

During the following months the new electoral system and local representative bodies were set up, and on June 30, 1920, the first session of the Assembly opened.

Such, in brief outline, have been the events which have given the Church the means for applying to her sacred task the spiritual energies of the whole body of those who have by baptism been admitted to membership and are of an age to exercise their responsibilities.

The Constitution of the new body was laid down in the Appendix to the Address to the Crown above referred to. Under it, the bishops and clergy are represented by the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York : their numbers

are: House of Bishops 38, House of Clergy 313. The 352 members of the House of Laity, who complete the Assembly, sit there as representatives of the Parochial Electors, persons of eighteen years of age, of either sex, who have been baptised and have signed a declaration that they are members of the Church of England, and that they do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England. A roll of such electors is to be formed and maintained in every parish.

From among these are elected the members of Parochial Church Councils, of Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences, as well as of the House of Laity. The numbers of the latter depend in each diocese upon the total number of the Parochial Electors: they are elected by the lay members of the Diocesan Conference. Members of all these bodies must be actual communicant members of the Church, of twenty-one years and upwards. They are described in the Constitution as Representative Electors, and a standard of churchmanship is rightly exacted from them higher than in the case of the general body of Electors.

It will be seen from what has been said that the Constitution lays the utmost stress upon the maintenance of the Electoral Roll, as the foundation of the whole system of representation of the laity.

It inculcates by inference the truth that merely passive churchmanship is a wholly incomplete thing: that the whole body cannot hope to perform the duty set before it by the Almighty unless its individuals are prepared to give as well as to receive, to recognise that they are members of an organised whole, and to take some share in the furtherance of the common task.

To many who have reflected upon the last seven years of the life of the Church it may well have seemed that the definite enunciation of this principle is almost the most valuable of the results which have followed

the passage of the Enabling Act. It is now some fifty-six years since elementary education became a recognised charge upon the thought and the resources of the State and the Community : if that education has not failed wholly to achieve its object, it must have fitted the general body of the people of this country to take some interest in those non-material parts of their life upon which the progress of the human race towards some higher state really depends. Of these the chief and the most vital is religion. It admits, surely, of no dispute that this definite call to the rank and file of the Church to take an interest, systematic and informed, in the task which faces her, and to share in the devising of means for meeting that task, is no more than a logical recognition of that increased responsibility which widened opportunities must always involve for those who enjoy them.

Under the Constitution the whole body of the laity is afforded the opportunity of direct association with the work of the Church, and this without trenching in any degree upon those special duties and responsibilities which must always attach to an ordained priesthood. That association, be it observed, is not merely consultative, nor does it depend upon the view of the incumbent for the time being, as in the case of the Church Councils which existed in many parishes before the recent legislation. It has a definite legal status, carrying with it definite responsibilities and full scope for real and effective work. In the parish the duty of the Parochial Church Council is, in the words of the Measure of 1921 dealing with its powers, 'to co-operate with the incumbent in the initiation, conduct and development of Church work both within the parish and without it' : truly a wide commission and indicative of the hope on the part of those who framed it that their fellow-churchmen would not fail of giving it a worthy response. The functions of Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences, though the

same specific reference is not made to them in the Measure, are intended to be carried out in the same spirit of co-operation between clergy and laity in the larger areas for which they are responsible.

Six years is a short period in the life of an institution such as the Church of England. It would probably be agreed, however, by most of those whose experiences afford them an opportunity of forming an opinion on the subject, that the hopes with which the new system was launched have been justified in no mean degree. The fact, for example, that the number of Parochial Electors is already about three and a half millions affords good proof that the impulse to make the status of churchmanship a reality is being widely felt.

Some consideration may now be given to what has been done by the Church Assembly during the six years which have elapsed since it thus took shape.

The Assembly meets, under normal circumstances, in February, July, and November, in the Great Hall of the Church House, each session extending over five days. In addition to these meetings, the Houses have held a considerable number of separate sessions in connexion with the Revision of the Prayer Book. The meetings of the various Committees which the Assembly has had to set up during the period under review have been very numerous, and represent in the aggregate a great expenditure of time and effort by those who have taken part in them.

As some indication of the amount of work done outside the actual sittings of the Assembly, it may be noted that in the summer of 1926 there were in existence two permanent and fourteen special Committees, with a membership of 480 ; five Boards and Councils with a membership of 161 ; and seven Commissions numbering 111. Not a few members of the Assembly sit on several of these bodies, and the burden in their case is plainly very heavy.

The procedure under which the Assembly does its

legislative work is contained in its Standing Orders, and is briefly as follows. When it is desired to make provision with regard to any matter requiring legislation, the Assembly takes action by introducing a 'Measure,' a document resembling in general outline what is known in Parliament as a Bill, and containing clauses and schedules. A Measure will in normal cases have been prepared by a Committee, the members of which, or some of them, take charge of it during its consideration by the Assembly. The stages through which it passes are: (1) Introduction, when it is printed and circulated to all members; (2) General Approval, corresponding more or less closely to a Second Reading in Parliament, when the general objects and principles of the Measure are discussed; if it survives this stage it goes next to stage (3), that of Revision, which, in the case of a large, complicated or controversial Measure, to which many amendments are moved, may involve a Committee Stage, and further Revision and Committee Stages, with a Drafting Stage to make verbal adjustments; after these comes (4) the Stage of Final Approval. The amount of time occupied by these stages must obviously vary very widely: the Clergy Pensions Measure, for example, to which Final Approval was given in the Summer Session of 1926, had occupied the Assembly in one way or another for three years, while on the other hand the Measure for the establishment of the Diocese of Leicester passed through all its stages within the limits of two successive sessions.

When a Measure has received Final Approval, it is referred to the Legislative Committee of the Assembly, and is by them presented to the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament.

This body, established by Clause 2 of the Enabling Act of 1919, consists of fifteen members of each of the Houses of Lords and Commons, nominated

respectively by the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker, to serve for the duration of the current Parliament. Its functions are laid down in Clause 3 of the same Act. They are to examine any Measure submitted to it by the Assembly through its Legislative Committee and to submit a report to Parliament, explaining the nature of the Measure and its legal effect, and stating whether or not it is expedient that the Measure should become law. The report is thereupon laid before both Houses of Parliament, after which it is open to any member to propose that the Measure be presented to His Majesty the King : when this has been resolved by both Houses, the Measure is presented, and on receiving the Royal Assent has the force of an Act of Parliament.

It will be observed that under this procedure Parliament, while retaining the power of veto over any Measure, has no power of amendment : it must either accept or reject. This provision, while insuring to the nation the continuance of that supremacy of the Crown as head of the Church which is necessarily implicit in the status of establishment, insures also that schemes of Church reform shall be formulated at leisure by a statutory body constituted for that purpose, rather than during such comparatively short periods of parliamentary time as may fall to the share of a private member by the working of the sessional ballot.

It may fairly be claimed that the new system, while preserving to the nation the ultimate right of consent or refusal, has put into the hands of the Church the power to deal effectively with the many features of her organisation which have long cried out for alteration. It is significant, for example, to compare what was found possible before the Assembly began its work with what has been done since then. During the twenty-five years between 1888 and 1913, of the 217 Bills dealing with ecclesiastical affairs which were introduced into the House of Commons, no more

than thirty-three, or 15 per cent., were passed into law : one was negatived, and the remainder were dropped from mere lack of the time needed for dealing with them. On the other hand, during the years since 1920, twenty Measures of the Assembly, many of them of far-reaching importance to the life of the Church, have received the Royal Assent, or nearly two-thirds of the former number, in less than a quarter of the time. No one, least of all any member of the Assembly, would assert that a mere counting of heads can be accepted as conclusive proof of whether or not the Assembly has justified itself : the facts just stated do however show that the Church now has a degree of liberty to adapt herself to her changing responsibilities such as she has never before possessed since Reformation times.

Any detailed examination of these nineteen Measures, and of the large amount of other work done by the Assembly, would be beyond the scope of this chapter. Some general survey will, however, not be out of place.

The first Measure to receive the Royal Assent made it possible for the Convocations of Canterbury and York to reform their constitutions and make themselves more nearly representative, instead of being, as heretofore, largely ex-officio bodies. The Parochial Church Councils, which had been called into being by the Enabling Act of 1919, were endowed with specific powers and duties by the Measure of 1921 : their rules of procedure were laid down, and their relations with the Incumbent and their predecessors in authority, the Vestry and Churchwardens, were defined. Having thus completed the fabric of the new system of Church government, the Assembly applied itself to the mass of work which it found confronting it, as the result of the fundamental changes in the life of the British people—changes in population, in economic conditions, in educational standards, in geographical

distribution, in imperial responsibilities—which have taken place during the last 150 years, and have inevitably resulted in changes as great in the task which faces the Church.

It may be convenient to review what has been done under the following main headings.

I

MAN-POWER OF THE CHURCH

The end of the war found the Church faced with a very serious shortage in the number of her clergy—a shortage which continues in an even greater degree to the present time. Some indication of the position is afforded by the numbers ordained in the nine years up to and succeeding 1914: the average for the former period was 598, for the latter 297; the total for the second period was 2,710 below that of the first. It requires about 600 ordinands each year to supply the wastage in the ranks of the clergy: the numbers being ordained are far below that. The effect of this state of things, which it may be remarked is by no means peculiar to the Church of England, is that there are many parishes of 10,000 people and more in which the incumbent has to take the whole burden without clerical help. The results in the way of overstrain to individuals and hindrance to the work of the Church need no emphasising. An equally grave fact is the increasing proportion of the clergy who are past their prime: it has been calculated that seven-eighths of their number are more than thirty-six years of age.

The Assembly could clearly not neglect this very grave state of things. It has appointed a special body, known as the Central Advisory Council of Training for the Ministry, or more usually as C.A.C.T.M., representative of the Assembly, of the Theological Faculties at the Universities, and of the Theological

Colleges, with some co-opted members, to deal with the whole question of supply, selection, and training of candidates for ordination. It has, by the provision of a very large sum of money, made possible the training and eventual entry to the Ministry of those candidates, many hundreds in number, who signified, while serving at the war, their desire to be ordained. Many candidates were required to pass through the Knutsford Test School, and all were subject to much careful inspection.

And, thirdly, it has made provision in its last three budgets for assisting, under carefully defined conditions, approved candidates for Holy Orders who are unable to provide the cost of their training at a university. There are good grounds for the view that, if the cost of such training can be met, a supply of men of the best type will not be lacking in the future, and that an increase in the number of such men may be looked for.

It may be remarked, before leaving this subject, that it is a general rule among nearly all other religious bodies that the cost of the training for the Ministry should be met from the corporate funds.

In addition to the supply of future clergy, the Assembly has dealt with the due distribution of the existing strength. By a Measure which became law in 1921 it has simplified the procedure for uniting such small parishes as cannot by themselves afford full work for an incumbent. This process of union is one which receives universal approval in the abstract and almost invariable opposition when applied to concrete cases. It is obviously open to the criticism that it breaks through the time-honoured principle that the Church should provide in every parish an ordained priest, to minister to the people and to maintain the standard of moral and religious life. No one who has known what the influence may be in a country parish of one who is truly father of his

people would wish to see any widespread abandonment of the traditional parochial system. But it should be recognised, on the other hand, that a geographical arrangement which has ceased to bear the same relation to the distribution of the people as it did in the first instance must be subject to reconsideration in the interests both of clergy and congregation.

It has long been a cause of reproach against the Church that, by the sale of livings, financial profit might be made out of the right of appointment to a sacred office. This abuse was remedied by the Benefices Measure of 1923, under which no such sale can take place in future after the next two vacancies.

Final approval was given in the summer of 1926 to a Measure designed to remove a grave blot from the Church's life, the absence, namely, of any sufficient provision for her clergy when past work. Many a hardworking and conscientious parson has been faced, near the end of his life, with the distressing alternatives of continuing to hold his cure, though knowing that he is physically unable to serve it, or of crippling his successor by retiring on a pension derived from the income of the living.

After three years of strenuous and exacting work, the Pensions Committee have now had the satisfaction of carrying through the Assembly, by an overwhelming vote, a Measure under which a pension is secured on retirement to every clergyman now under fifty-five years of age. The amount of the pension varies from £237 a year at age seventy, after forty years' service. Annual contributions are paid at the rate of 3 per cent. of his stipend by every clergyman of pensionable age. The contributions of those who die before the receipt of pension are returned with compound interest. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners provide the sum of £350,000 as the capital foundation of the Pensions Fund, and an annual contribution rising to £100,000. The Church at large, through the Assembly Fund,

provides a further £50,000 a year. The Measure is of great length and complexity : its provisions had to be adjusted, by prolonged negotiations, so as to accord with the rights of contributors to the existing Clergy Pensions Institution and with the effect of the Incumbent's Resignation Acts. The prolonged and heartfelt applause with which the Assembly greeted the figures of the final vote marked not only their satisfaction at the attainment of a great reform, but also their sense of the debt which the Church owes to Lord Phillimore, and to those who worked with him, for their devoted and deservedly successful labours.

All who have any knowledge of the lives of the clergy, especially in country districts, have long been aware of the load of anxiety often thrown upon them by the expense of repair of their parsonage houses, sometimes far too large for present-day needs, or cumbered with outbuildings for which there is now no use. The case has been by no means unknown of the widow of an incumbent being left wholly destitute through the incidence on her husband's estate of the cost of such work, often too long deferred. The whole matter has now been dealt with by the Dilapidations Measure of 1923, the result of prolonged labour by a Committee under the chairmanship of the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich. The Measure instituted a system of regular inspection and survey, with annual contributions of duly assessed amounts ; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners undertook to provide a sum up to £500,000 towards the cost of putting the parsonage houses into repair; the help of the Parochial Church Councils is regularly invited towards the annual contributions required from the living; and the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, who are the Central Authority under the Measure, are empowered to pay, for livings not over £250 a year, half of the initial cost and of the annual charge. Superfluous buildings can be more easily got rid of, and no additions may be

made without the consent of authority. The whole question has been put on to a businesslike footing, substituting a regular system for uncertain and often catastrophic demands. Many Church Councils have definitely undertaken the burden of what should be a parochial and not a personal liability, and it may be expected with confidence that this will gradually become the general rule throughout the Church.

The constantly increasing complexity and difficulty of the task which faces the clergy of to-day makes it increasingly important that they should not lack any encouragement and support that can be given to them, whether through personal contact and sympathetic help from their leaders, or from a renewed sense of their membership of an organised whole, inspired by a common aim. Such an atmosphere can hardly be looked for if the leaders of the Church are responsible for areas so wide or parishes so numerous as to make personal knowledge of their clergy, and still more of their laity, a practical impossibility. This fact has long been realised, and has led, during the last half-century, to the establishment of fourteen new dioceses. The conviction that this process of readjustment was still incomplete led to the appointment, in the Assembly's first year, of a new Sees Committee, to investigate and recommend what further division of existing dioceses should be undertaken. Following upon their report, Measures have received the Royal Assent for the division of the dioceses of Winchester, Peterborough, Manchester, and Southwell, and the creation therefrom of new dioceses of Portsmouth, Guildford, Leicester, Blackburn, and Derby. The Measure for dealing with the diocese of Lichfield, after receiving final approval in the Assembly, was rejected by one vote in the House of Lords, not on principle, but from disagreement with the method proposed for dealing with an admittedly urgent need.

That such changes demand sacrifice from those

involved in them is, of course, a truism. Apart altogether from the large sums of money required for the endowment of the new bishoprics, and perhaps for the necessary adaptation of some parish church for use as cathedral of a new diocese, no churchman can view without a pang the end of a great historic entity such as the diocese of Winchester, or look forward with indifference to the severing of active relations with those among whom he may have worked for years. It remains true, however, in this as in all other causes, that without sacrifice no lasting good can be brought about ; and the really astonishing success with which the necessary funds have been raised not only affords proof of a general conviction that what has been done is right, but is a happy augury for the future Church life of the new areas.

II

THE MATERIAL RESOURCES OF THE CHURCH

In January of 1921, at the request of the Assembly, the Archbishops appointed a Commission, rather more than half of the members being laymen, to make enquiry, under terms of reference of the widest kind, into the Property and Revenues of the Church, their extent, and whether they were being so applied as to carry on as efficiently as possible the work of the Church. After three years of most comprehensive enquiry, the Commission issued its Report, a document of extraordinary interest and value and containing a mass of information on all aspects of Church finance. The Report concluded with a number of recommendations for a wider application of the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, for a more equitable distribution of the total income available for the parochial clergy, for the institution of a system of pensions, for sundry reforms in the administration of the estates of cathedrals and in the payment of the stipends of

bishops, and for many other changes directed to the more efficient discharge of the duties of the Church.

With some of these recommendations the Assembly has already dealt, as will have been seen from what is written above. Others have been remitted to three Commissions appointed specially to examine them further and to make detailed suggestions for action.

Some observations on the current financial work of the Assembly will be found later in this chapter: this part of its responsibilities can hardly be dealt with apart from the wider claim upon the Church as a whole.

The part of the Assembly's work which has attracted public attention the most strongly has been the discussions on the revised form of the Book of Common Prayer. It is not, perhaps, generally realised that this subject, fraught with issues of vital importance to the future of the Church, has not by any means been raised for the first time by the Assembly. It is connected very closely with another question, that of Ecclesiastical Discipline, which has exercised the mind of the Church for many decades past. Twenty years ago the Royal Commission of 1904 reported that the law of public worship in the Church of England was unduly narrow for the religious life of the present generation, and needlessly condemned much that was valued by many members of the Church, among them some of the most devoted. Convocation thereupon began the consideration of the forms of service contained in the Prayer Book, and the Assembly succeeded to the responsibility of dealing with the question when it took shape in 1920. A Committee appointed in that year reported in 1921 on the revised Table of Lessons, and in 1922 upon the remaining proposals handed over to it by Convocation. It was decided that any change should take the shape of alternative forms, for optional use, and it was in accordance with that decision that the Revised Prayer

Book Measure of 1923 contained in its title the words 'Permissive Use.'

Under the constitution of the Assembly, any Measure concerned with doctrines or forms of worship has to be considered by the Houses sitting separately, and afterwards be accepted or rejected, without amendment, in the form in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops. In accordance with these provisions, the Houses of Clergy and Laity each held a large number of separate sittings in the years following the introduction of the Measure, at the conclusion of which they handed to the House of Bishops the results of their labours. At the time of writing, the consideration of the whole matter is still in the hands of that House. Their sittings have, for obvious reasons, been wholly private, but at the beginning of the session of the Assembly in July 1926 the Archbishop stated that the progress made, and the whole spirit and tone of the discussions, had been such as to afford great encouragement to look forward to successful issue.

Any observations upon the specific proposals of either the clergy or laity would plainly be out of place as well as futile. It may, however, not be inappropriate to place on record the conviction that this great and most difficult question has been discussed, in both Houses, with a desire, on the part of the vast majority of their members, to deal with the form and detail of ceremonial in a spirit of true comprehensiveness, while maintaining unimpaired the doctrinal position of the Church of England. It is devoutly to be hoped that the result of the labours of the House of Bishops may be the passage through the Assembly and through Parliament of a Measure such as will give recognition to the changes, both in language and in environment, which have taken place during the past two hundred and fifty years, and will afford a sure prospect of restoring that 'order and regularity

in the worship of the Church of England' to which Resolution No. 11 of the House of Laity looks forward.

Considerations of space will not allow of more than an allusion to the many other questions with which the Assembly has been concerned during these first six years of its life. The Missionary Council, by its World Call Reports and its Convention at St. Paul's-tide, attended by 2,700 delegates from every part of the country, has placed clearly before the Church in England the almost overwhelming responsibility which present-day conditions of communication and of world-wide change are laying on the shoulders of the British people. The Education Commission has done much to make plain, to those whose own association with the work had not already impressed it upon them, the rapid changes in that part of the Church's task which are being brought about by the raising of the age for attendance, the development of grouping and of central and secondary schools, and the increasing proportion of children who are being taught in Council Schools.[1] In these and in other directions the Assembly has applied itself to those aspects of the work of the Church which are national and imperial in their origin, as well as to the arrears of more domestic reform to which reference has already been made.

No sketch of the work, legislative and deliberative, of the Assembly would be in any sense satisfactory without some note of what the Church has gained in other ways beside that of definite change for the better in this or that direction. The association, during these six years, of bishops, clergy, and laity in debate and in committee, in formal consultation and in informal conference, has done more towards welding the Church together, towards arousing a sense of corporate responsibility for the forwarding of her sacred task in

[1] More specific reference to these two vitally important subjects will be found elsewhere in this volume.

the world and a keener realisation of the fact that that responsibility can only be discharged if it is faced by a united whole animated by a common purpose, than could ever have been effected by the most diligent perusal of the most lucid and able reports or the delivery of the most eloquent sermons. It is beginning to be true of the National Assembly of the Church of England, as it is often said to be true of the House of Commons, that mere membership of it has an effect, difficult perhaps to define, but nevertheless real, upon those of whom it is composed. Differences which seem so clear-cut outside it are found to be unaccountably mellowed, when those of divergent views have collaborated for the attainment of some reform which all desire : sectional attachments become insensibly blended with an increased reverence and attachment for the great National Church to which all are proud to belong.

It would be difficult to appraise the debt which the Assembly owes, in this and in many other directions, to its chairman. As was so well said at the unveiling of his portrait in the Church House during the July session of this year, not the least of the blessings which have followed the Enabling Act has been that so many churchmen, clergy and laymen alike, have obtained personal knowledge of their leader the Archbishop in a fashion and to a degree that would otherwise have been impossible. The Church has been happy indeed in that her representative body has had, to guide it through its opening years, one in whom a lifelong experience of affairs in Church and State, ripe and clear-sighted judgment, and a broad-minded Christian tolerance are so conspicuously united.

An attempt has been made in the foregoing pages to indicate the lines upon which the Assembly has done its work, and to show that the Church possesses in it an instrument which may be potent for good in no common degree. But this can only be if the work of

the Assembly is followed and understood by the whole body of Church people, clerical and lay alike, and if the means, both spiritual and material, needed to make that work effective are provided in response to the lead given.

The primary need is that interest, intelligent and informed, in what the Assembly is doing should be widely spread throughout the Church. The Press and Publications Board of the Assembly takes great pains to supply regular and accurate intelligence to the daily and weekly newspapers on the work of the Assembly and its various organisations. The Board issues only news : it avoids all comment, confining itself to recording facts. During 1925 it was able to trace about 3,000 paragraphs in various English newspapers, and it may be concluded, from the experience of other bodies, that many more appeared of which it has no record. The ' Church Assembly News,' issued every month, and the Church papers in general devote a good deal of space to the Assembly's doings. There is no lack of opportunity for the individual churchman, who is not himself a member of the Assembly, to keep himself acquainted with what is before the Church, awaiting his sympathy and co-operation. It should surely be a matter of course for every member of a Diocesan or Ruridecanal Conference, and for every Parochial Church Councillor, to keep himself informed and in a position to answer the questions of his fellow-churchmen. Without such general understanding, the work of the Central Board of Finance can scarcely receive the support of the dioceses to the full extent. That wider knowledge results in more complete response is proved by the growth of the contributions : in 1923 the dioceses gave 60·1 per cent. of what they were asked ; in 1925 this proportion had risen to 71·5 per cent., six dioceses sending 100 per cent. Such figures are full of encouragement for the future. It is becoming, with

every year that passes, more general for Diocesan Boards of Finance to include their contribution to the Church Assembly Fund as an obligation of equal urgency with what is needed for their own domestic work. In finance, as in all other ways, the Church as a whole cannot meet her responsibilities unless she has the loyal, because informed, co-operation of every part.

This same principle, that without knowledge and information there cannot be co-operation and sympathy, holds true in the Diocese, the Rural Deanery, and the Parish. The new representative system provides the skeleton : it is for churchmen themselves to clothe it with living tissue and make it a worthy instrument, fit to take its share in carrying out the sacred task to which the Church stands committed.

The facts recorded in this chapter may surely be taken as showing that the Church of to-day is instinct with life, and with a desire to do her Master's work, as intense as at any time in her long history. The sure ground for hope for the future which this affords is strengthened by the reflection that her relations with other Christian churches of this country were never more cordial. (See Canon Bate's chapter in this volume.) Of all the barriers which the four years of the war did so much to shake, there is none the weakening of which has been more unmistakable or more welcome than that which once stood between the Church of England and the Free Churches. Alike in the advocacy of the claims of missionary work, in the consideration of social problems, and, more lately, of the question—rapidly growing so urgent—of Religious Education in the elementary and secondary schools, great numbers of clergy and laymen of all the Churches have learnt that the things which unite them are not less real than any that may to-day divide them, and that in co-operation, wherever and whenever co-operation is possible, lies the most direct line

towards their common goal—the advancement of the Kingdom of God.

And if this be true of the relations between the Church of England and the Free Churches, it is equally true of her relations with the State. The number of those, whether in Parliament or out of it, who feel the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church to be the prime need of the religious life of the country is probably a small fraction of those who would have advocated this view twenty years ago. It is becoming more widely realised that the real struggle is rather against the forces of indifference and of hostility, and that it behoves all those to whom religion presents itself as the transcendent element in human life to aim at whatever degree of common action their convictions and their opportunities may render possible.

To sum up, then, it may reasonably be felt that, heavy as is her task and serious as are her weaknesses in some respects, the Church may nevertheless look forward with confidence to the future, if she can but foster and develop the spirit of mutual co-operation and support within her ranks and the willingness to take a personal share in her work which so many of her members, in all walks of life, display.

Note.—The writer desires to express his obligations for much of the information set forth above to the various publications of the Church Assembly, notably 'The First Five Years,' and to Macmorran's 'Handbook for Churchwardens and Parochial Church Councillors.' He would acknowledge most gratefully the help kindly given him by Canon Partridge.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

BY THE RT. REV. A. A. DAVID, D.D.
(Bishop of Liverpool)

SYNOPSIS

I. The *control* of education, originally in the hands of the Church, has gradually been acquired by the State. To the new situation, thus created, the Church must adapt itself by seeking to *inspire* rather than control. The difficulty of this adjustment is illustrated by the Elementary School controversy . . pp. 131–137

II. An examination of present opinions in the Anglican and Free Churches and among teachers suggests the possibility of a new co-operation between them in the application of teaching methods, based (1) on the *educational* interest of the child, and (2) on the training of the teacher in such method, and on his own religious adherence and development . . . „ 137–146

III. There is also a wide field of activity open to the Church in the sphere of Adult Education, and in stimulating by this and other means a popular demand for religious influence and instruction on broad lines in the Universities and the Secondary Schools . . „ 146–147

VI

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

I

THE PAST

This chapter is an attempt to set forth the existing claims and influence of the Church in the work of national education, and to offer a prospect of their development. But we cannot rightly understand the present situation, or usefully suggest what may come of it, without a brief survey of that which lies behind it.

One of the main facts in the history of Education in England is that it was rooted and grounded in the Church. The work of teaching was regarded as belonging to officers of the Church, and was controlled by Church authority. It is true that in the mediaeval Universities there was considerable freedom of intellectual life. Almost any religious opinion could be discussed and defended. But when new expressions of truth began to bear fruit in practice ecclesiastical authority asserted itself. It was amply strong enough to use the opportunity presented by Lollardism for the strengthening of its control over teachers and learners at Oxford and Cambridge.

As to the schools, Mr. Leach in his 'Educational Charters and Documents' tells us that 'in England, from the first, education was the creature of religion, the school was an adjunct of the church, and the schoolmaster was an ecclesiastical officer. For close on eleven hundred years, from 598 to 1670, all educational institutions were under exclusively ecclesiastical control. The law of education was a branch of the canon law. The Church Courts had exclusive juris-

diction over Schools and Universities and Colleges, and until 1540 all schoolmasters were clerks, or clerics or clergy, and in Orders, though not necessarily Holy Orders.'

After the Renaissance educational development under the auspices of the Church was very rapid, but the Reformation checked it, and the long and bitter controversies of the seventeenth century destroyed initiative and reduced opportunities which depended on the control of the ecclesiastical party in power. In 1603 it was enacted by canon that every teacher, whether public or private, must subscribe to the Articles of Religion and to the Prayer Book, and be licensed by the Bishop. The parish priest, if duly qualified, was given a preferential right to this licence in towns where there was no Grammar School. In 1665 an Act was passed forbidding Dissenters to teach under a penalty of £40.

It was not until the nineteenth century that the State began to conceive of an educational responsibility beyond that of supporting ecclesiastical control. At first this was discharged by making grants towards the National Schools, the main burden of the cost both of buildings and maintenance being left to the private beneficence of individual Churchmen and to the 'National Society.' It may be fairly claimed that in this educational revival the Church was first in the field; and it was due to the inspiration of her example that in 1870 the State entered that field with a full provision of primary schools in places not already occupied by the Church. In these new schools religious instruction was allowed, but not required, to be offered. In most it was, and continues to be, given to all except to an infinitesimal proportion of the children withdrawn for conscientious reasons. But by the famous Cowper-Temple Clause it must not contain teaching distinctive of any denomination; and the schools were to be controlled by popularly elected bodies. Thus was created a class of school in

which the Church had no part or lot whatever. The Church schools, and a few administered by other denominations, continued side by side with the 'provided schools,' but with increasing difficulty; for the standard of popular education rapidly rose, and with it the expense. The Church made gallant efforts to meet the new demands, but the task was hopeless. In 1902 State aid was accepted in return for a larger share of control, and the Dual System was given a fresh lease of life. But the great increase in the cost of building and repairs which followed the Great War brought it to a still more serious crisis, and the issue is still uncertain.

Thus the administration and control of elementary education has been gradually passing by a natural and inevitable process out of the hands of the Church into the hands of the State. The same transference has affected secondary education, but more slowly. Many of the old endowed Grammar Schools, unable to cope with the increasing complexity and cost of educational demand, have been taken over by the public authorities. Only the Public Schools, supported by a class that can afford to pay fees which represent something like full cost, have maintained their independence. But most of these while adhering to the 'principles and practice of the Church of England' have no definite connexion with the Church. At the older Universities almost all the 'test' requirements have disappeared, and although in some respects the Church of England is still in a position of privilege, yet for practical purposes it depends upon an influence exercised side by side with that of other religious bodies.

II

THE PRESENT

The Universities

In considering the part actually taken by the Church of to-day in English education it will be well to begin

at the top, and to enquire how far its influence affects teaching and life at Oxford and Cambridge. It must at once be acknowledged that, judged by any ordinary standards, this influence is at a low ebb. Chapel services (now in most cases no longer compulsory) are ill-attended. Undergraduates declare that they have had 'too much of this sort of thing' at school, and claim to be exempt 'for the present.' It must, moreover, be confessed that the ordering of the Service in most Colleges is very dull and uninspiring. Very few Fellows of Colleges are in Holy Orders, and of these not all are capable of a sympathetic interest in the task of adapting public worship to the religious needs and benefit of the young. Of the remainder, most are apt to discourage experiments. The result is that although a few have been tried with notable success, on the whole college chapels have escaped the refreshment of liturgical method and expression discernible elsewhere since the War. The attendance of undergraduates at University Sermons is still very meagre, and even the congregations attracted by well-known preachers, at times arranged to fall in with undergraduate habits, has lately shown a marked decline. The number of men offering themselves for ordination is very small, and students of Theology for its own sake are rare. On the other hand, a well devised 'Mission' grounded on an intellectual rather than an emotional appeal always draws and holds large numbers. Moreover, the ideal of adventurous service has neither here nor elsewhere lost its call. Each University has begun to send out bands of undergraduates for evangelistic or missionary work in industrial towns. These are inspired and organised largely by the Student Christian Movement, an interdenominational body, in which Churchmen take a full share. It shows the most promising signs that can at present be discerned of religious vitality both in the older Universities and in the new.

The Universities of recent foundation have more or less designedly excluded ecclesiastical connexion. It may be assumed that their motive was to avoid the entanglements of inter-church controversy. The unfortunate result has been, not only that in most of them the study of religion compared with other studies is at a serious disadvantage, but also that the view of life officially, at any rate, presented to the students is altogether devoid of the religious interest. I imagine that if challenged they would answer that their business is to provide such teaching and influence as appears to be demanded. It is for the Church and the Free Churches to create an effective demand for religion.

The most disastrous effect of this situation is apparent in the departments (attached to nearly all Universities) for the training of teachers. In most of them the facilities for study and practice in the art of giving religious instruction are of the scantiest. And this is all the more serious because the Board of Education is at present using every encouragement to induce those who intend to teach in Elementary Schools to acquire a University Degree. This policy has much to recommend it. But at present it will mean that most of the teachers in Elementary, as well as in the smaller Secondary Schools, will be prepared for their work entirely in places where so little importance is attached to religion that students being trained for the teaching profession are not even taught how to teach it.

Secondary Schools

In the Secondary Schools administered or aided by Local Education Authorities the religious situation could hardly be worse than it is, and it is here that Church influence is at its weakest. In the great Public Schools and the smaller schools which share their independence of grants from public funds, Church influence counts for something, partly because

it is traditional, and partly because it is not pressed. Moderately exercised it is accepted by non-Anglican parents without protest or even suspicion. But in the newer and State-aided schools there are no traditions. Governing Bodies are indifferent and sometimes hostile; masters and mistresses, on the whole, are ill-equipped; and the result is that the teaching of religion is generally poor, and its observance either perfunctory or altogether absent. For this situation it is unfair to blame either the Board of Education or the Local Authorities. From the educational point of view they are bound to regard the Anglican Church as one among many 'denominations.' They cannot rightly admit in publicly supported schools the activities of one without admitting all. It may well be argued that in the best interest of national education there should be as wide a variety in schools as possible, and that on that ground alone encouragement should be given to the Church and other 'denominations' if they desire to make their particular contributions through schools of different types. There is reason to believe that this policy is gaining ground. Till the year 1921 the Board was by its own regulation debarred from giving certain grants of public money to any school in which the head or any other teacher is required by Statute to belong, or not to belong, to a particular denomination. But in that year, and at the instance of the Board, an Act was passed allowing a school restricted by such a requirement to read its Statutes, for the purpose of obtaining the grant, in a contrary sense. This may seem a roundabout way of evading a regulation which, for various reasons, it was inexpedient to withdraw. But at least it shows a readiness to recognise that public money may rightly be spent on schools available for all, but specially designed for a particular section of taxpayers, and in that design maintaining a particular character and corporate life by which the whole educational system

is enriched. It is much to be hoped that this policy may, for the same reasons, be further developed in dealing with the elementary schools.

Elementary Schools

This section of our subject calls for fuller treatment because for the last fifty years it has attracted widespread and violent public interest, and has almost monopolised the educational concern of the Church. Nearly everybody, however ignorant of the principles and practice of education, has something to say about the 'Religious Question in the Schools.' This is a real misfortune, because it has concentrated the attention of the Church on one department of the educational field so closely that quite inadequate thought has been given to its teaching office in other regions. Moreover, the controversies which have raged around the schools have been bitterly prejudiced by other than educational considerations, and have been conducted with a closer regard to ecclesiastical and political rights than to the mental and spiritual interests of the children. Most of the protagonists on either side are indeed fully competent to argue about buildings and trust deeds and syllabuses and regulations. They have loudly proclaimed the rights of churches, of owners, of managers, of teachers, of ratepayers, of parents. But the voice of the teacher himself, whose business it is to mediate to the child what results from the welter of this conflict, and of the student of education who can see the wood as well as the trees, have been but faintly heard. Had it been possible from the beginning to commit the issue to a body of men with some real claim to leadership based on a wide experience in the whole field of education, and apt to look forward as well as backward, it would have been settled long ago.

Happily there are now signs that some of the extraneous issues which have warped public judgment

are fading into the background, and there may be consolation for the tragedy of past bitterness in the fact that some principles are at last emerging on which the Church may, if it will, base an educational policy of co-operation with other agencies such as would carry hope of real effect. But before we examine this new possibility it is necessary to set forth briefly the present attitude of each of the parties chiefly concerned, namely, the Church of England, the Free Churches, and the teachers.

What is the range of opinion among Churchmen? Some of them are firm in their conviction that the only religious education really worth giving is so bound up with the distinctive doctrines of the Church that it can only be given to children who are members of that Church. Therefore, they say, we must concentrate upon the Church schools in the hope that their products will leaven the rest. Others feel that the Church cannot hope to fulfil her educational duty, even to her own children, by concerning herself only with her own schools, for many thousands of Church folk send, and must continue to send, their children to council schools. They hold, moreover, that the Church of England is responsible, as no other religious body can be, for the children of the nation at large. They desire therefore that it should take a full and, if possible, a leading share in interpreting and carrying out the general wish that all English education should bear the impress of Christianity. And most of those among them who have practical acquaintance with the work of instruction now realise that what is commonly understood by 'denominational teaching' does not suffice in the elementary stage. There was a time when it was supposed that the only way to get the elements of anything into a child was to make him learn a series of statements about it. These statements appeared to the teacher to be extremely simple, and his own experience had taught him that they were

important. They did not always appear so simple or so important to the child. Yet when he could answer questions correctly by repeating these statements, the teaching was regarded as successful. But we know now that it was a false standard of success. Nowadays children, if they are well taught, begin their study of geography or science or whatever it may be, out of something which is, or can easily be brought, within their own experience. The full logical statement of what they learn is reserved till they are ripe for it. Unhappily there are some who still believe that the Catholic faith can be imparted to children bit by bit in logical order, till, by the teachers' patience and their own perseverance, they have absorbed it all. And the result too often is that they reject much of it in after life, because when it came to them it came too soon.

Many again, while sharing this broader educational view, are nevertheless unwilling that Church schools should be merged and lost in a unified system in which all elementary schools shall be in aim and teaching exactly alike. They believe that schools definitely attached to a particular Church have a contribution of their own to make, and that there is virtue in variety.

The attitude of Free Churchmen is dominated by a sense of grievance. They complain that they are unfairly treated in many villages and other places where the only school to which their children can go is a Church school. It is true, and I think they recognise, that some Churchpeople also cannot get the teaching they want. But it is obvious that the injustice of the present system falls more heavily on Nonconformists. What teaching do they want? Among some the traditional theory still persists that in any school supported or aided by the State nothing more should be allowed than the use of the Bible, so taught that no reference shall be made to any credal doctrine derived from it. But others are not satisfied with simple Bible teaching. The child must be given something

more than the historical material out of which the Christian Faith was built. They seek for a teaching which shall be definite, yet free from emphasis on the tenets of any particular religious body, and they are ready to join with Churchmen in the task, already well begun, of establishing it.

What do the teachers say? They have been quite definite in their resistance to one or two elements in solutions already proposed. They disapprove of all plans which involve two or more kinds of religious teaching in the same school. Here we must sympathise with them. Any teaching-subject must suffer unless the children are grouped according to their capacity to learn it, and on no other principle. They disapprove of plans which involve the bringing into the school of a teacher of religious instruction from outside. That would inevitably lower the subject in the eyes of the children. Moreover, the teaching of a large class is a special art in which few outside the profession have been or can be trained. Here again they are right. Some of them also disapprove of a qualification of competence to give this instruction which would be demanded, in most of the schemes proposed, of any teacher who offered to give it. They regard such a demand as the imposition of a religious test. Here surely they are wrong. Nobody, nowadays, proposes any attempt to test a teacher's personal faith or his sincerity. In any case there are no means of doing either. If he is willing, that is enough, provided that he can show that he is competent. The teachers have, at present, one real grievance. It lies in the fact that so large a proportion of head teacherships are open to members of the Church of England only. It seems to them, as belonging to one profession, that the restriction interferes unjustly with the promotion of the best men and women in it. This cannot be denied. Otherwise the teachers as such have not yet, so far as I know, revealed any definite attitude or attitudes on

the real issues before us. I have no doubt that they desire, as much as anybody, that definite Christian teaching should be given in all schools, and would like to improve their part in it. What holds some of them in suspense is partly the painful and repellent atmosphere of controversy which unfortunately surrounds the whole subject, and partly the doubt whether they have been properly equipped for the task, and this, through no fault of their own, is by no means always the case. It is much to be hoped that, in future attempts to solve this tangled problem, the teachers may be taken into full consultation. If so, it is not enough to ask them whether they will be satisfied with this or that. They should be invited to contribute a positive and creative share, in full confidence that they will take a broad and unselfish view. They know more than any of the other parties concerned about the needs and chances of the child.

At first sight we may well feel bewildered by this complexity of conflicting views among those to whom the State is turning for an agreed solution of a long-standing difficulty. The situation seems far more complicated than it was twenty years ago, when the simple issue was joined between the Church on the one side and Nonconformity on the other. But there is gain in the fact that at least this old line of cleavage is being abandoned. Churchmen and Nonconformists no longer feel bound to take opposite views. The problem is not going to be settled by the victory of one of two sides, by the successful assertion of one set of rights over the other. There is less talk now of rights, and of justice for these and those. And the reason is that one interest, hitherto strangely obscured, is coming to its own—the interest of the child. The whole question is now becoming what it ought to have been from the first, namely, an educational question. When this fact is fully grasped there will be good hope of a speedy settlement.

III

THE FUTURE

The Elementary Schools

Enough has been said about the religious difficulty in the elementary schools to lead up to the outlines of a policy which I venture to suggest would carry out the true function of the Church in national education. There can be no doubt that a hundred years ago that function was best exercised by the ownership and administration of as many schools, both elementary and secondary, as possible. But for fifty years, at least, the State has made itself responsible wholly for primary, and largely for secondary education. This fact has changed the whole situation, and it cannot be altered. It is useless to sigh for the old conditions. We must adapt ourselves to the new ones, and in them seek new opportunities of effective influence.

Does this mean that the Church should forthwith abandon all its schools? Logically no doubt the Dual System should be replaced by unified control. But education is, or ought to be, too human and vital a thing to be governed strictly by the rules of logic. For the present, at any rate, the Church should keep in its own hands the strongest of its schools to serve as models of the type of school which it has assisted to evolve, and there is reason to believe that the Board of Education and many of the Local Authorities would welcome this survival of a kind of school which has proved its value. Such schools would, of course, retain full control over the religious instruction given therein. The remaining Church schools would be transferred on conditions in regard to repairs, use of buildings out of school hours, appointment of teachers, etc., to be determined locally. In cases where the existing managers are not satisfied with the religious instruction offered in the provided schools, and until it is made adequate, these terms would doubtless include

'distinctive teaching,' say twice in the week, to be given to Church children, either in the school buildings or elsewhere.

If the question of dual ownership could be settled on some such lines, the Church would be free to devote itself to two far more central problems, concerning the teaching given and the training and inspiration of the teachers who give it. The first of these ought to be shared with religious leaders of other Churches, duly qualified for the task. Fifty years ago this suggestion would rightly have been regarded as impossible. And even now there are many who are afraid of it because they assume that such discussions would involve arguments about doctrinal differences, intelligible enough to adults with comparatively mature minds, but for which children up to the age of fourteen can care but little, and need not yet to understand. If the child is really 'in the midst,' and if those who are responsible for awakening his religious consciousness are able with free minds to study him and his approach to Christian truth, there should be no fear of theological dissension. For they would enter on this study in the light of much new knowledge about the development of the child's mind and spirit which anticipates all the discussions awaiting him in later life. It can be, and is being, translated into a teaching which is not *un*-denominational and therefore mainly negative, but rather *pre*-denominational, that is to say, a positive building up of mental and spiritual faculty in terms of life as the child sees life—a basis which is assumed (but not always possessed) in members of all denominations equally. I should not maintain that such a preparatory course would be sufficient in itself for Church children. I do not think that in any case 'religious instruction' given in school, however 'distinctive' or 'denominational,' can suffice for the whole religious training of the child. For lessons in school must, in the nature of things, be concerned

mainly with knowledge *about* God. But that by itself is not enough. The child must also be trained in the personal side of his faith. He must have practice in the presence of God, he must experience contact with the Spirit, and therefore he must receive also knowledge *of* God. I would not contend that these two kinds of knowledge are altogether separable. They interlace, and depend one upon the other. They are two sides of the same knowledge. But it may still be claimed that the latter can be offered more definitely in church and in Sunday school than by a day-school lesson. For this reason the Church should press on with the modern development (already amply justified) of teaching-method in the Sunday school, with special emphasis on the aim of training the children for worship and prayer, and should avail itself to the utmost of the right to withdraw its own children from lessons in school to observance in church. Thus supplemented by distinctive preparation for devotional Church life, a common course in school for children of all denominations up to the age of fourteen would be found equally satisfactory by all who understand real capacity for religious growth. And in taking its share of the task of promoting it the Church would fulfil one of the greatest services it can render to the religious welfare of the nation.

The Teachers

The second problem presented to the Church, under the new conditions of this century, concerns the training of the teachers, the men and women who have direct and daily contact with the children. On them depends the whole efficacy of the religious teaching given. The most perfect syllabus and the strictest regulations count for little compared with the personality, the convictions, and the skill of the teacher. And all these might be developed in the course of his training if

adequate facilities were available. Here, again, is offered a favourable opportunity for co-operation with other religious bodies. The Church might, if it would, give a powerful lead in the demand that in all Training Colleges and Training Departments of Universities it should be possible for students, who desire it, to receive special instruction and practice in the art of teaching the Bible, and of presenting religious conceptions to the young. If it should be maintained that our divisions make such provision impossible, the answer is that for reasons already explained the objection is out of date. It may further be urged that students are unwilling to receive this preparation. It is true that they are not greatly attracted by that part of their training as now offered to them. Where it is denominational it is too often, even in Church Training Colleges, rigid and dogmatic; where undenominational, it is dull. But it must be remembered that recent research has transformed the art. Imparted as it ought to be, with full and frank recognition of the need to study not only the subject-matter of the lessons but also the capacities, the vision and the impulses of the children who receive them, it becomes the most interesting of all teaching subjects and permeates, as it ought to, all the rest. If lecturers and teachers alike were once set free from suspicions about proselytising and fears of 'denominational rows,' and left to the common aim of developing the first stages of religious consciousness in the child, there need be no doubt that it would of itself attract.

But the teacher's intellectual preparation for giving religious instruction, essential though it be, is not enough. In order that what he teaches may make effective contact with the children's lives it must proceed from the centre of his own. In other words, we desire that as many as possible of those who give it should be convinced and active members of a Church. During their training they should have ample and

acceptable opportunities of developing their own religious life, and it is the business of the Churches to provide them. Here they must work separately. The Church of England has already the advantage of its training colleges, and the Church Assembly has shown a wise foresight in securing the future of three of the largest, while continuing to support them all. It is to be hoped that this policy will be developed, for it is certain that one good training college, caring sympathetically for the student's religious as well as his intellectual growth, has more spiritual potentiality than many Church schools. Lastly, it should be the care of the Church of England to offer in every University some provision for the religious welfare of its own students-in-training, whether by hostels or by some other centres of influence. It is at this stage that the 'distinctive' side of Church life may most fruitfully be pressed, for no one would deny that religion is best taught at any stage by those who acknowledge and practise a Church allegiance of their own.

Further Education

The future influence of the Church in Secondary Schools and the Universities depends, likewise, on breadth of view and sincerity of conviction in those who have direct teaching contact with the young. In so far as they are inspired with a sense of the Church's mission to the nation and the world, with a belief that this mission involves adventurous endeavour first to think rightly about God, and to discern His Will, and, secondly, to co-operate with Him in its accomplishment on earth; in that degree will they fulfil the Master's command to 'teach' in the full sense in which that command is passed to us, namely to make 'disciples,' that is learners, of those who are ready to submit not only their minds but their whole selves to the Leader and Master of their lives.

But this department of Church work is not confined to the Universities and Schools. There are large numbers of adults who feel that they have arrears to make up. Till recently means for their guidance were few and hard to find. Now, in the face of a much increased demand, there is arising a more abundant supply of opportunities. The Church Tutorial Class Association is taking a leading part both in providing tuition and in promoting the formation of a central authority which shall co-ordinate the activities of many smaller societies now making separate experiments of their own.

There is beyond any question a new and widespread hunger and thirst for knowledge about God, and for the promised guidance of His Spirit into all the truth. 'Give ye them to eat.' If the Church is to obey that command of her Master it can be only upon two conditions. First, we must draw men and women as Christ drew them to Himself, by understanding them, by believing in them, by a generous faith in the possibility of human goodness. We must teach not 'as the scribes' by merely repeating denunciations of wrong-doing and exhortations to be righteous, but with the 'authority' He has given us to liberate interests and stimulate thought, as He did, and to open new visions to the imagination. Secondly, if the Church is to teach men and women of to-day she must herself be learning. No longer, as often in the past, must she be hostile or indifferent to any adventure of the intellect. In every advance of human knowledge she must discern a striving after truth of the Eternal Spirit in the human mind, and in it seek for some new channel of revelation. So fulfilling her twofold task of teaching and learning she may hope to regain a leading part with a far more vital influence in education than in the days when she claimed to control it.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

BY THE RT. REV. J. H. B. MASTERMAN, D.D.
(Bishop of Plymouth)

SYNOPSIS

The future of political and economic problems. Change in Christian attitude . . . . pp. 151–153

I. Resolutions of Lambeth Conference (1920). Personal salvation and social service . . . . ,, 154–156

II. The Church and politics. Social co-operation and reunion. The twofold duty of the Church . ,, 156–161

III. Influence of (1) the Catholic ideal, (2) missionary effort, (3) protection of the right of self-determination, (4) moral significance of property, on the Church's social teaching . . . . ,, 161–165

IV. The ideal of the Kingdom of God, evolutionary or apocalyptic. The Christian Crusade . . ,, 165–169

VII

THE CHURCH AND POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

What attitude will the Church of England be likely to assume in the future in regard to the problems of political and economic life? The only way in which we can hope to answer this question is by considering the tendencies of thought and action within the Church to-day, and the direction in which they point. We cannot be sure that the future will grow out of the present by a natural process of development, but when we find certain tendencies gathering force in the life of the Church we may assume that they will continue to gather force in the future. It is only by interpreting the present that we can hope to be able, in some degree, to predict the future.

The wisest man might well hesitate to forecast the future of our national life in its political and economic aspects. Perhaps the only prediction that can be made with confidence is that economic problems will become increasingly the dominating factor in political life, both internationally and internally. The indications of the moment seem to point to the gradual loss by the middle class of its controlling influence in English political life, and—less certainly—to the development of a new labour aristocracy based on the Trade Union movement, and tending in fact—though not in intention—to depress the status of unskilled labour. What is certain is that the programme of the Labour Party constitutes a challenge to the present economic system, and to the whole structure of society, resting, as it does, on an economic basis. Claims to privilege and respect founded on wealth or rank are resented, and the demand for equality of opportunity

grows more insistent. Yet it would be a mistake to represent this country as heading for revolution. The complex structure of English social life makes such phrases as 'the domination of the proletariat' mere verbiage, and no attempt by any party or group to seize and control the political machine would be likely to succeed. We should rather look for the gradual evolution of a new social order, based on new economic conditions.

There is no reason to anticipate that this process will take an anti-Christian direction. The claim of the Labour Party is that its programme represents, better than the teaching of the Churches, the application of the principles of Christianity to human life. Its impeachment of the Churches is not that they are Christian, but that they are too deeply embedded in the existing social order to protest effectually against the wrongs and injustices that it entails. Combined with this there is a feeling of irritation at the apparent lack of fellowship between the various Christian Churches, which have seemed more anxious to defend their distinctive forms of worship and organisation than to assert the law of righteousness in all relations of life. It must be admitted that there is ground for this impeachment, but recent years have brought a great awakening of the Christian conscience, in our own as in other Churches. The isolated protest of a Maurice or a Westcott has passed, partly through the work of the Christian Social Union, inspired by Bishop Gore and Canon Scott Holland, into the general consciousness of the Church, and has found expression in such movements as the Industrial Christian Fellowship and C.O.P.E.C.—the significance of the latter being increased by the fact that it represents the co-operation of almost all the Christian Churches of Great Britain.

The basis of the C.O.P.E.C. Conference was 'the conviction that the Christian faith, rightly interpreted

and consistently followed, gives the vision and the power essential for solving the problems of to-day.'

'In recent years Christians of all denominations have recognised with increasing conviction that the commission to "go and teach all nations" involved a double task. Alongside of the work of individual conversion and simultaneously with it an effort must be made to Christianise the corporate life of mankind in all its activities. Recent developments since the industrial revolution, the vast increase of population, the growth of cities, the creation of mass production, the specialisation of effort, and the consequent interdependence of individuals upon each other, have given new significance to the truth that we are members one of another. The existence of a system and of methods unsatisfying, if not antagonistic to Christian life, constitutes a challenge to the Church.' [1]

What has really happened is that we have begun to see sin as a great social fact, and have realised that much of the suffering and degradation of the world is the outcome not of inevitable laws but of human mismanagement and injustice. Judgment has begun, as it ought to begin, at the House of God. It has only begun as yet; there is still a great reluctance on the part of Christian men and women to shake off conventional ways of thinking and to face the conflict that must inevitably follow any determined effort to apply the ethical teachings of Jesus Christ to the social and economic problems of modern life. But 'the proper impulse has been given,' and as far as our Church is concerned it has been given by its spiritual leaders. The Anglican Bishop of contemporary fiction has ceased to bear the slightest resemblance to the actual Bench of Bishops, most of whom are much less anxious to protect the social prestige and ecclesiastical predominance of the Church of England than to discover how to make its protest on behalf of social righteousness effective.

[1] C.O.P.E.C. Commission Reports. General Preface.

I

THE MORAL WITNESS OF THE CHURCH

The last Lambeth Conference (1920) includes in its Report a number of resolutions on social and industrial questions. Among the most significant are the following :

'An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private or sectional advantage. All Christian people ought to take an active part in bringing about this change, by which alone we can hope to remove class dissentions and resolve industrial discords.' 'The Church cannot in its corporate capacity be an advocate or partisan, a "judge or a divider," in political or class disputes where moral issues are not at stake ; nevertheless even in matters of economic or political controversy the Church is bound to give its positive and active corporate witness to the Christian principles of justice, brotherhood, and the equal and infinite value of every human personality.'

'Members of the Church are bound to take an active part, by public action and by personal service, in removing those abuses which depress and impoverish human life. In company with other citizens and organisations, they should work for reform, and particularly for such measures as will secure the better care of children, including real opportunity for an adequate education, protection of the workers against unemployment, and the provision of healthy homes.' Dr. Inge has recently reminded us that 'the strength of Christianity is in transforming the lives of individuals —of a small minority, certainly, as Christ clearly

predicted, but a large number in the aggregate. To rescue a little flock, here and there, from materialism, selfishness and hatred, is the task of the Church of Christ in all ages alike, and there is no likelihood that it will ever be otherwise.' It is true that the transformation of personal character—the making of saints—is the primary task of the Church, and no enthusiasm for social betterment can atone for failure in that task. But the making of saints does not mean the creation of a mutual benefit society detached from the social order. It is in the battle against wrong, in the

> prompt cheery thud
> Of glove on ground that answers ringingly
> The challenge of the false knight

that saints are made. 'I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and seeks her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat.' One of the most significant changes in church thought in this generation is the transfer of emphasis from the idea of personal salvation to that of service. Since the Christian cannot withdraw himself from mundane concerns—'for then ye must needs go out of the world'—he must either cease to act as a Christian when he deals with political and economic affairs, or he must assert the right of the Christian ideal to rule social and industrial life. The realisation of this alternative is creating a new social conscience, and the voices that are calling the Church to leave the social order to go its own way, and confine itself to the salvation of individual souls, win their loudest applause from those who regard any disturbance of the social order as a thing to resent and resist.

'The Church does not exist solely for the saving of its members' souls—or rather they can only be saved as they take full part in its missionary activity. It is

because Christianity can only be fully realised in a wholly Christian world, that it is driven by its own inherent nature to take part in and seek to harmonise with itself those activities and institutions of the world's life which are at present opposed to it. If the whole world were not essential to Christianity, Christianity need not be essentially concerned to redeem it. There has come to Christians of all denominations in recent years a revival of the conviction, that only in service and sacrifice for the winning of the world can they attain spiritual health ; that their duty is not simply mutual edification but active sharing in a great enterprise.' [1]

II

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS

This conviction is gradually growing among members of our Church, though for various reasons it is probably less widely accepted as yet than among Free Churchmen. In so far as Churchpeople recognise that the Church exists as God's instrument for the service of humanity, they cannot adopt an attitude of detachment in regard to political questions, since politics, rightly understood, mean the art of public service.

But though our Church will, in the future, probably take a keener interest in politics, it is, on the whole, unlikely that it will ally itself with any particular political party. Its long-standing alliance with the Conservative Party is gradually coming to an end, and though Labour still distrusts it as the friend of reaction, that distrust is slowly disappearing. It is all to the good that Churchmen should take an active share in the work of every political party, for if any party were able to claim a monopoly of Christian idealism, the alternative party or parties would almost inevitably become anti-Christian.

[1] C.O.P.E.C. Report, No. 1.

There are many political questions on which the Church is not called, or qualified, to express an opinion. Christian men may legitimately differ on such matters as the nationalisation of mines or railways, tariff-reform, systems of land tenure, and methods of taxation. Any attempt to formulate a legislative programme that all Church voters would be expected to support would certainly fail. But it is highly desirable that members of the same Church should speak often one to another about the application of Christian principles to the problems of public life. An alert Christian public opinion would be the best safeguard against the predominance of party or sectional interests in political life. To whatever political party a Christian man belongs, he is bound to insist that the candidate to whom he is asked to give his support shall be a man of high personal character. And he is bound to make it clear that he is committed to ethical principles that have a stronger claim than any party allegiance. The Christian Church could, if it chose, lift great social questions out of the arena of party controversy. The housing question, the protection of women and children in industrial life, education, the regulation of the drink traffic, touch the moral issues of life so closely that the Church cannot regard them as matters in which it has no concern. The Church of England has now a constitutional machinery through which it can give expression to the considered opinion of Churchpeople on such questions as these, and the Church would not be fulfilling its duty to the nation if it failed to arouse public opinion to the significance of great moral issues that call for national sacrifice. It would be a real misfortune if, through timidity or preoccupation with its own affairs, our Church remained inarticulate about such matters. The demand that the Church should keep out of politics often means that it should be content to support the particular party to which the speaker belongs. When it means more

than this, it means either that the issues that arise in political life are no concern of the Church (which is often true), or that politics are too unsavoury a business for the Church to be mixed up with (which, if true, would be as urgent a reason as could exist for the whole-hearted intervention of Churchmen).

This fuller recognition of the social implications of the Christian gospel has provided opportunities of service in which the various Christian Churches can co-operate without any sacrifice of those distinctive principles to which they regard themselves as committed. It may be long before the obstacles that now stand in the way of reunion can be overcome, but the effort to bring Christian ideals to bear on social and economic problems has already drawn the Churches into closer fellowship. The Temperance Council of the Christian Churches illustrates a method of action that may be applied to other problems, and the recent Conference at Stockholm carried the same idea into the International sphere. Those of us who were present at that Conference brought back with us a strong conviction that the development of an International Christian conscience in regard to social and economic questions is not an unattainable idea but a practical possibility.

In the struggle for social righteousness and international goodwill the Church will become increasingly conscious of its unity. If, in the providence of God, the Roman Church could be led to abandon its attitude of isolation, the way would be open for a League of Churches as the spiritual counterpart of the League of Nations. While avoiding doctrinal controversies, such a League would have as its purpose the application of Christian principles to the economic and political problems of the world. It might carry out, on a larger scale, the work that is being so successfully done by the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. It is becoming

increasingly clear that no nation can work out its economic destiny in isolation, and the refusal to recognise that we are members one of another can only end in the breakdown of the whole economic structure of human society. The civilised world may be forced to accept co-operation as the only alternative to dissolution. But co-operation must have a higher motive than self-interest if it is to have moral value, and it would be a strange reversal of the true order if the world became more catholic in material than in spiritual things.

Whether the Church of England will retain its status as an Established Church in fifty years' time must be regarded as an open question. It may surrender that status to facilitate closer union with the (so called) Free Churches or as a means of securing greater freedom for itself in the choice of its bishops and the administration of its discipline. But it is at least possible that this freedom might prove illusory, and a Church like ours is generally disposed to bear what ills it has rather than to fly to others that it knows not of.

Whether as an established or disestablished Church, we may expect the stronger social consciousness of the Church of England to find expression in a more earnest appreciation of the significance of public service. We shall recognise more clearly, perhaps, that the work of a Member of Parliament or Town Councillor may be quite as definitely Christian work as those more specifically religious activities to which that title is sometimes confined. And this is equally true of industrial and commercial life. It is often very difficult for the employer to reconcile the policy of his Federation, or the working man the policy of his Trade Union, with those high standards of justice and honour that the Christian ideal demands. The Church must help such men more than it has done in the past, not only by saying, 'Sirs, ye are brethren,' but by

prayerful efforts to build up a system of Christian ethics in relation to the social and economic problems of our time. The mere unsupported assertion that 'the Church' teaches this or that is not likely to influence a generation that is impatient of authority. Our Church must learn to commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

In relation to human society, the Church has a twofold duty. On the one hand, it must set before its own members the claim of the Christian ideal to regulate all departments of life. A Christian man cannot be content to accept current standards of morality in business or social life. He is called to set a standard that is in accord with the Christian principles of honour and justice. For the isolated individual, this is an almost impossible task, but in the fellowship of an organised society he receives the sacramental grace that he needs.

On the other hand, the Church has also a corporate witness to give. The moral law is binding on all men everywhere, and it is the office of the Church to be the conscience of the world, the salt that shall preserve the body politic from decay and dissolution. So 'whenever in the working out of economic or of political theory moral issues are directly involved, the Church has a duty to see that the requirements of righteousness are faced and fairly met. The Church will, for instance, maintain that fellowship is endangered if all who serve do not share equitably in the results of labour. For this is part of Christian justice. The Church will fearlessly claim that the human character of every worker is more sacred than his work ; that his worth as a child of God and member of the fellowship must not be forgotten or imperilled by any form of industrial slavery. For this belongs to the spirit of Christian liberty. In all such things the Church will, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, proclaim its message of brotherhood and mutual

service, founded on the Divine purpose for men, and will aid the community in giving active expression to it.'[1]

III

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN THE FUTURE

There are certain directions in which the Anglican Church is likely to speak with a different accent in the future.

(1) If the Catholic movement in the Church of England can overcome the danger of exaggerated preoccupation over details of ceremonial and ecclesiastical procedure, it may be a valuable corrective to the insularity of English religion. Few events in recent history have been as tragic as the impotence of the Christian Church to avert or delay the outbreak of the late War. A Catholic Church that was true to its name would outlaw war between Christian nations, and would set itself firmly against those inflammatory outbreaks of national egoism that constantly menace the peace of the world. No Church that is content to be merely national can hope to achieve the task of the redemption of human society. For while there is a place for national distinctions within the universal Kingdom of God, such distinctions must be subordinate to the ' brotherhood, that binds the brave of all the earth.'

(2) Another movement that is bound to have consequences in the political and economic sphere is the growing earnestness with which our Church is facing the world call for missionary effort. For the task of the evangelisation of the world cannot be dissociated from the economic questions that arise out of the contact of Europe with the non-European peoples. A Missionary Church must face the problems involved in the development of industrial life in the East, the struggle for the control of raw material in Africa, the

[1] Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference (1920).

illicit trade in arms and alcohol. It must take account of the rise of nationalist aspirations, and the demand for secular education that is everywhere becoming articulate. It is by its attitude towards these questions that Christianity will be judged by the non-Christian peoples of the world. The missionary call of to-day demands the wisest statesmanship as well as the most whole-hearted devotion.

(3) The increasing intervention of the State in the personal life of the individual will tend, if it goes on, to limit the right of self-determination in a way that may become injurious to moral character. In the sphere of religion the Church must guard this right with ceaseless vigilance. Morality is only possible in the atmosphere of freedom, and the efforts of the Church must be directed, not to the suppression of the freedom of the individual in the (supposed) interest of the community, but to the creation of such conditions of life as shall make self-determination not the privilege of the few but the common right of all. Under existing economic conditions, the worker is constantly obliged to surrender his freedom in return for a measure of security. An industrial system based on Christian principles would offer a better security against injustice and economic exploitation. It is vain to protest against the tyranny of Trade Unions or Employers' Federations till Christian influence has been able so to moralise industry as to make such tyranny unnecessary.

(4) The Church must work within the existing structure of society, even when that structure corresponds very imperfectly with the Christian ideal. From the first, the fellowship of the Church was endangered by the intrusion of class distinctions,[1] and there is constant need still for the assertion of the equality of all men in our acts of public worship. The gradual disappearance of pew-rents is a hopeful indica-

[1] See 1 Cor. xi. 18–22; St. James, ii. 1–4.

tion of progress in this direction. But our Church has never faced courageously the larger question of the moral justification of the social order. We have in the past given only too much occasion for the travesty of the Catechism which represents it as teaching that every man should be content in that station of life into which it has pleased God to call him.

> The rich man in his castle,
> The poor man at his gate,
> God made them, high or lowly,
> And order'd their estate.

The Church of the future will have to find some better justification of the social order than this doctrine of the divine right of existing economic conditions. A false standard of values runs through English social life, and fosters self-indulgence at one end of the social scale and embittered resentment at the other. To turn the social order upside down will be no remedy. We must learn to estimate human values by a different standard, to regard great wealth, as Jesus Christ regarded it, as a hindrance rather than a help to the spiritual life, to welcome as an ally every man who sets before himself as life's true purpose 'not to be served, but to serve.' To denounce covetousness in men living on the margin of poverty, while we condone it in men whose incomes are fully adequate to their needs, is a complete reversal of Christian standards of life.

(5) The whole question of the moral justification of private property is at issue in modern life. One result of the Reformation, and of the industrial changes that followed it, was the breakdown of the mediaeval doctrine of property as a trust. The fact that Church-people had been taught to regard the exercise of the acquisitive instinct as not only legitimate but praiseworthy blinded their eyes to the evils of the Industrial Revolution, and we are only now awakening to the truth that industry exists, not primarily that individuals

may be enriched, but that human needs may be supplied and men's creative powers may be exercised. If it is true (and it is less true than is sometimes supposed) that the chief motive of the leaders of industry is to 'make money,' the Church must present the service of the community as a better and more inspiring motive. There is no more urgent need to-day than the moralising of the Capitalist system—if it can be moralised. The Christian conscience cannot acquiesce in an economic order that allows individuals to appropriate wealth created by the community. There are many practices in modern business, such as the distribution of bonus shares, the accumulation of undisclosed reserves, and the limitation of output with a view to keeping up prices, which the Church, if it is to offer moral guidance to men, must investigate more carefully that it has yet done. Those of us who regard Socialism as a counsel of despair are bound to show some more excellent way, or we shall justly forfeit our right to be heard. It depends very largely on the Churches in this country whether the present discontents prove to be the birth-pangs of a better age or the pangs of dissolution of a dying society. What we need is some clear principle that will guide us through the complicated readjustments that are required to bring back hope and joy into the lives of men. We are finding this principle in the Incarnation with its assertion of the supreme value of human personality. A Church that believes in the Incarnation is bound to claim for every child adequate education, physical, mental and spiritual ; the decencies of home life ; green places in which to play ; and reasonable security against standing all the day idle, when schooldays are over, because no man hath hired him. In making that claim the Church is necessarily confronted with the problem of the over-fertility of nature. It is possible to hold that the question of birth control is one that must be left to the conscience of the individual.

If the Church desires to offer any guidance to its members when perplexed in a conflict of duties, such guidance must be based on something more than a mere refusal to face plain facts.[1] The unhealthy obsession with sex problems that seems to be an inheritance from war conditions may be expected to subside as the world becomes normal again, and Freud ceases to be the high priest of a new psychology. But we shall probably never return to the reticences of the Victorian age, and the Church of the future will have the difficult task of steering between the danger of exaggerated attention to sex questions and the opposite danger of refusing to face moral problems that are distasteful and difficult.

IV

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The changed attitude of Churchpeople towards economic and political questions is inspired by the conviction that the Kingdom of God is not (or at least need not be) an apocalyptic breaking in of a Divine order on the ruins of the present world-order. Though the Christian ideal does not control all departments of human life in England to-day, we are not using idle words when we speak of England as a Christian country. The influence of Christianity reaches out far beyond the organised Christian societies, and the life of every man and woman, and even more of every child, is different, to a degree that it would be difficult to exaggerate, from what it would be if that influence were to cease. The Kingdom of God *is* amongst us, imperfectly realised as yet but growing with every development of human fellowship and goodwill. Only faithless hearts need despair of the future.

[1] The report of the special committee on *The Ethics of Birth Control* is a courageous attempt to face the facts. It shows how much investigation is needed before a final judgment can be given on the whole subject.

It is this conception of the Kingdom of God as an order to be realised, in some measure at least, here and now that is leading many in our Church to give themselves to the task of social reform. We do not forget that the ultimate purpose of the Church is to bring every man into personal fellowship with Jesus Christ, but we remember that in the beginning the gospel of the Kingdom prepared the way for the gospel of the King. It is still the business of the Church to preach 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, repent and believe the good news.' So wherever greed or injustice sets men at variance, wherever human personality is stunted by an environment that denies to it adequate opportunities for self-expression, wherever cruelty and oppression haunt the dark places of social life, there the Church must lift up the standard of the Kingdom and assert the sovereignty of God. For the Kingdom of God means something more than the gradual improvement of human society. If by a change of the economic structure of society we could create a Utopia from which poverty and class antagonism and the haunting fear of destitution were banished, the Kingdom of God might be just as far off as ever. It is our Father's Kingdom for which Jesus Christ taught us to pray, and while the Church must labour to redress all human wrongs, it must keep the other-worldliness that remembers that this world is not a playground but a school for the training of souls. The Kingdom will only come when the universal law of brotherhood is founded on the recognition of the One Father from whom every family in heaven and earth is named. To the Christian man, social reform can never be an end in itself. It means making straight in the desert a highway for our God—clearing away the obstacles that human sin and selfishness have imposed in the way of the coming of the King.

But it is not the highway, but the coming of the King for which the world is waiting.

We need the warning of one of our wisest scholars. 'We are to work for the Kingdom of God in the Church and in the world ; we may hope that in both it is to be realised far more conspicuously, far more in correspondence with its reality, than it has ever been in the past ; but we have no certain knowledge of the issue to which God's providence is leading human history, or whether the moral government of God among men is destined some day to be more perfect than it is now. We are to seek the Kingdom of God within us ; but even should God give us grace to realise it more than we have yet done in our personal character, we shall be the more conscious how miserably imperfect it will be even then. Within and without, the higher we set our aim, the more earnestly we seek the Kingdom of God, the more certainly will failure mock us and humble us ; the more certainly must we be prepared to witness the frustration of the highest hopes we have cherished, the apparent downfall of causes with which our most sacred convictions are intimately concerned, and to bear the galling shame of personal self-reproach. The Passion and the Cross, the Dereliction and the cry of death, must enter into our individual experience before we can endure with cheerful courage, confident in the hope that is set before us.'[1]

The teaching of Jesus Christ seems to present two alternative possibilities. The Kingdom of God might come by a process of evolution—'like leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.' If the Church could win, that is the way in which it would come. But if the Church should fail—and the possibility of failure was present to the mind of Jesus Christ—then the Kingdom would come in another way, not spreading like leaven but breaking in like lightning.

There are many indications that we are at a critical

[1] Bishop Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 386.

point in the history of the world, and that the next half-century will be one of the great turning-points of history. The tremendous material advance of the last hundred years must be balanced by a corresponding spiritual advance, or the last state of the world may be worse than the first. Can the Churches—can our own Church—lead this spiritual advance? To answer 'yes' would be rash, but to answer 'no' would be faithless. At least we are sure that the younger generation will be more eager to respond to the challenge of a new crusade for the Kingdom of God than to any sectional appeal. The Church must find the secret of strength not in withdrawing within well-defined frontiers and standing on guard over its holy things but in going out fearlessly to do battle with every evil, counting as its enemies only those who are the enemies of the Kingdom. The Christian creed must vindicate itself in the production of the Christian character—the character whose notes are 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.' The outlook is at once urgent and hopeful—urgent, because the time is short within which the Church can act effectively; hopeful, because many who have despaired of the Church have not despaired of Christianity. The younger generation is not interested in the controversies that fill the correspondence columns of our Church newspapers, but it is interested in the redress of human wrongs and the ennobling of human lives. 'Christianity,' say the authors of the C.O.P.E.C. Report, 'is incurably romantic as well as impenitently utilitarian; and life on this earth for the children of God is not the out-working of some mechanical scheme, nor yet simply a time of training in a preparatory school, but a splendid adventure and voyage of discovery.'

Our own Church may seem ill-equipped for leadership in so arduous an adventure as the redemption of human society, yet in its historical traditions,

its sacramental system, its freedom from centralised authority, it has great assets. If we can only learn that 'the best defence is a vigorous offensive,' directed not against our fellow-Christians but against all the powers of evil that hinder the coming of the Kingdom, there is good hope that we may win back the moral leadership that we have sometimes seemed too willing to forgo.

REUNION

BY THE REV. HERBERT NEWELL BATE, M.A.
(Canon of Carlisle)

SYNOPSIS

In regard to Reunion, a review of opportunities and tasks is less precarious than an attempt at prediction. The practical character of the present movement, arising from the peculiar activism of this age, has already weakened the particularist spirit . . pp. 173–176

I. Three contrasted views of the problem—(1) the Roman view, that unity already exists, and Reunion is logically impossible; (2) that of extreme Protestantism, which regards visible unity as neither possible nor desirable; (3) a liberal Catholic view, which regards unity as an essential and as yet unaccomplished task of the Church . . . . . ,, 176–182

II. Policies resulting from these views—(1) submission to Rome; (2) 'federalism'; (3) the movement towards a truly Catholic unity. 'Federalism': its practical advantages, its essential inadequacy as an ideal, and its dangers as a policy. If Reunion is the goal, the first step now is the education of the rank and file of the Church, (*a*) as to the evils of disunion and the incompleteness of our own corporate life, (*b*) as to the present world-wide reactions against those evils . ,, 183–191

III. With this should go the continuation, over a wide area, of the discussions resulting from the Lambeth Appeal. Those discussions are not exhausted; the issues, *e.g.* as between 'continuity' and its opposite, have not yet been fully considered on either side. In respect to the Ministry, the problem of 'validity' is specially ripe for further consideration . . ,, 191–195

VIII

REUNION

We are in some sense, I suppose, the trustees of to-morrow. Though it is not for us to know times or seasons, since the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and we cannot tell what fresh impulses from on high will claim the obedient co-operation of our children; though we must be content to hope that they will more readily discern the time of their visitation than our generation has done, yet the future is not wholly outside our control, nor can we ignore the fact that our action or inaction, our wisdom or short-sightedness, will make it either easier or harder for our sons to redeem their opportunity when it comes to them.

Therefore we must look forward; yet I should shrink from saying even one word about the future of our Church in the spirit of irresponsible prediction. It is not easy to write true history even about the age that lies behind us, and I confess that I should deeply mistrust anyone who proposed to write that of the age which lies ahead. The Church's life depends upon creative factors which we can neither command nor restrain; we can, indeed, see some of the pieces on the board, but the great game that is being played has not often justified the sagacity of those who imagined themselves able to forecast the details of its progress.

But there is a way of looking ahead which is less precarious. If we are convinced that the Church has been called to attempt certain tasks, tasks which seem beyond the power of any one generation to accomplish, it is not presumptuous, we may hope, to ask ourselves how we may best prepare for their advancement, and how we can make such progress in our day that our

successors will find them a little less intractable than we have done.

In virtue of its actual nature the problem of Reunion is specially inaccessible to prediction. There is no impropriety, and there may be some profit, in forecasting the probable development of Biblical study or of missionary endeavour ; but we are not entitled to go very far with the question what the relation between Anglicans and Congregationalists will be in fifty years' time. There is a risk of real discourtesy in presuming to predict the mind and temper, the acceptance or refusal of change in other religious bodies than our own, whether Catholic or Protestant. Reunion involves a mutual readjustment of delicate relations ; it is concerned, as we shall see, not only with possible changes in Church order, but with deeper changes of spirit and outlook. It is legitimate to try and imagine what the mind of a reunited Church might conceivably be, and to estimate the demands for wide charity which it would necessarily make upon its members ; but to foretell the disappearance of this or that antipathy, or the abandonment of this or that theory of ecclesiastical order, might easily provoke reaction, and lend new vitality to the forces which have created and maintained our old divisions.

The range of permissible prediction, then, is strictly limited, and it seems best to follow the counsel of the Sphinx, *τὰ πρὸς ποσὶ σκοπεῖν*, to consider the things which lie immediately before us, to estimate the progress which the movement towards Reunion has already made, the difficulties which it now encounters, and the steps, if any there are, which the logic of the present position suggests as the corollary of all that has hitherto been achieved.

The last few decades have witnessed a very marked change of temper in Christendom. No organised Church stands now, in relation to its neighbours and rivals, exactly where it did thirty years ago. The change of which I speak coincides with, and is probably

related to, a similar difference which is observable in men's attitude towards the working of social and economic laws ; such laws, we now feel, are the spheres of our opportunity rather than the masters of our fate. The conative element in our make-up counts for more than the environment in which we play our part. Hence the man of the twentieth century tends to regard much that his forefathers took to be inevitable simply as the result of misdirected human endeavour, a result which human wisdom and goodwill must strive to undo. Slums, war, prostitution, and a host of other social evils may be the portion of his inheritance ; but he regards them rather as items in his list of *agenda et corrigenda*.

The wastefulness and futility of our religious divisions have been deplored for long enough ; but the present movement towards a concerted attack upon the walls of partition is surely to be traced in part to the new activism of this age. Men can no longer acquiesce in a spectacle so melancholy without asking how it can be remedied ; they can no longer be content to regard it as the inevitable result of causes deep-rooted in the past ; they are driven to ask whether those causes, if they are still operative, cannot be counteracted. Through such questionings the individualism of the severed Christian bodies has already been profoundly modified. Not only have actual fusions here and there been brought about, but it would seem as though the sectarian spirit, the fissiparous tendency in Christendom, had met with a definite check and counterpoise in the movement of groups toward each other and towards a common mind. No denomination is so assured and comfortable in its isolation as it once was. Particularism, except in a very limited and apologetic form, is passing out of fashion.

Thus the definite and purposive efforts which have been made towards Reunion in recent years have a wider background than is always understood ; their appeal, and the success which has so far attended them,

are due in part to vital changes in the general outlook, or, as I would rather say, to a definite leading of the Spirit of God, apart from which they would have been impossible or fruitless. It is as though the ground were being prepared for greater changes still. The strength of our denominational barriers may prove to be much less real than it now appears to be. It needs no prophet to discern that if the next few decades modify them as deeply as the last have done, Christendom will present a very different spectacle from anything which our fathers knew. The tide of desire for a truly Catholic Church is rising ; no man can predict how far it will reach, or by what ebbings and subsequent recovery it will be followed But if it ever became a full flood-tide, carrying with it the general assent of Christian people, we may be certain that no existing barriers could stand against it.

What has been said so far would perhaps be seriously disputed by no one. But from the recognition of the fact that the inter-denominational situation is undergoing a change, and that this change is being accepted on many sides as a call to action, we must pass on to observe that it is not universally so accepted, and that the interpretations which are being put upon it, and the lines of action which it is prompting, are many and diverse. I may be allowed to single out three types of view, resting upon three diverging conceptions of history, as being of special interest and weight.

I

First of all in political importance is the attitude maintained by the largest and most venerable of all Christian communities. To the Roman mind the symptoms of unrest, and of a reaching out after a larger fellowship, which are discernible in so many non-Roman communities, are deeply significant as manifestations of the fact that outside the Roman

obedience there can be no peace for the Christian soul. The movements to which they give rise, however, cannot strictly be described as movements towards reunion. The nature of the Church is such that within it there can be no schism. It is possible to break away from the fellowship of the visible Church, and individuals or communities which do thus break away are so totally severed from Christ's Body that they are wholly extruded from the totality of its members ; their severance does not divide the Church, for it is essentially indivisible. And as the Church is indivisible, it follows that it can never stand in need of reunion. There may be reconciliations and restorations to communion, extruded communities which have lost the essence of Christianity may recover it by submission, but for such reintegrations the word reunion is in strict logic inadmissible.

The rigidity of this logic is, of course, not infrequently relaxed in common practice ; but the theory on which it rests is inflexible, and behind it lies the conviction that the See of Peter is now, and always has been, the one centre of Christian unity ; that the authority of the Catholic Episcopate is derived from that See as its source, and that Christians in East and West alike are obliged to own it as their absolute over-lord and unquestioned guide. On this view, the severance between East and West, and the disruption of European Christianity in the sixteenth century, were defections from an achieved reality of ecclesiastical oneness ; and the ideal of Christian unity is the restoration of what lay behind those epochs of schism. The responsibility for the tragedy of the sixteenth century does not lie upon Catholicism. The forces of disruption were generated by minds alienated from the Church, and took the form of an attack from without. The great Church has suffered violence : yet it persists under its one earthly head, and within it there is no division ; its sole task, in relation to

unity, is to recall those Christians who stand outside it to an obedience which once did hold, and ought now and always to hold, all Christians together in precisely that form of unity which our Lord bequeathed to His first disciples.

At the farthest possible distance from all this we find a view, and a theory of Church history, widely and perhaps increasingly prevalent among Protestants, which leads to a diametrically opposite conclusion. The Christian movement, on this view, fell away at a very early stage from the Apostolic ideals of grace and freedom. Intellectually, it made terms with Hellenism, terms involving its progressive subjection to dogmatic forms which hampered and obscured the life of the Spirit. Organically, it took on a fixity of form and administration which obliterated even the memory of the freedom characteristic of the Apostolic age. In origin—and that which was original was also ideal, and reflected without distortion the mind of Christ—it was a totality of scattered fellowships, each of which was complete in itself, and developed its own organisation in entire independence ; the Spirit of Jesus was its sole bond of union, and that Spirit expressed itself in no visible form or order. Originally, too, each community was free to work out the teaching of Christ for itself, fettered by the imposition of no credal unity from without or from above.

The lapse of the Church from this ideal liberty was continuous and progressive : on the one side it was manifest in the development, first of episcopacy, and then of metropolitan jurisdiction ; and the legalism which thus gave rigidity to the structure culminated in the growth of the Papacy, with its claims of universal supremacy. On the other side the supersession of the simple Gospel by intellectual formulae led inevitably to the stereotyping of theology, and to its usurped domination over the Christian mind, through the disasters of the conciliar period.

By the end of the Middle Ages, the evil fruits of all this complex evolution along lines diverging from the spirit of the Gospel were fully matured. The mediaeval Papacy, with all its corruption, was the logical outcome of fifteen centuries of distorted growth. By God's mercy, however, the acuteness of the evil, together with a rebirth of knowledge which enabled men to confront it with radical criticism, brought about a violent and destructive reaction. The essence of the Gospel was rediscovered ; the figure of Jesus Christ, obscured for centuries, emerged from the darkness, and with the rediscovery of Jesus Christ came the rediscovery of the Church. The simplicities of the New Testament were now found to reveal all that the Church could ever need for its instruction and for its ordered life. The Spirit of Christ appeared indubitably to require a complete break with the ecclesiastical tradition of the past. It was impossible to maintain a ministry which should be truly Apostolic except by a complete abandonment of every criterion of ministerial status which had hitherto borne the name of Catholic : impossible, too, to be faithful to the purity of the Gospel except by enthroning the Bible, and the Bible alone, as the source and the test of doctrine.

Thus the Church was re-born, Apostolic and pure ; and the Church of the Reformation took the place which the Church of continuity had usurped. Catholicism had worked itself out to its inevitable end. Since that epoch, Church history has flowed in new channels. These channels have undergone division and subdivision. But this fact is relatively unimportant. The divisions of non-Catholic Christendom may be regarded as reproducing something of the liberty and independence which marked the individual Churches of the Apostolic age. Christ is one for us all and in us all, and therefore we are one in Him ; all other modes of union must, at best, be external, and therefore relatively worthless. And while Catholicism was

exclusive, Christianity is inclusive. Conformity to the Spirit of Christ is the only possible test for Church membership. If a man possesses this, he is *ipso facto* within the Church, and nothing that any Church can do will effect more than a recognition of the pre-existing fact.

It follows that the conception of a visible Church, with a definite system of faith and order, can have little if any value : at any rate, its pragmatic value shrinks almost to the point of disappearance over against that of a Church invisible, formless, bodiless, and creedless, yet real in the mind of God, and real in the spiritual experience of those who know themselves to be one in Christ with all believers. Therefore, in face of the facts of division, Protestant Christianity needs to make no apology except for the failure of charity which obscures its essential oneness ; and it has no mission to attempt the achievement of any vast structure of visibly recovered unity. Schemes for reunion had best be left alone. Each Church had better recognise the inherent right of every other to exist ; yet, since there are things to be done in the world which call for common effort, it will be well if this recognition takes a federal form. The Church will then be felt to express its invisible unity in a multitude of free organisms, possessing an indeterminable power to add to their number, and owning no terms of communion which would exclude any Christian-hearted man from full participation in each and all of them.

I have sketched this position at some length, partly because it, or something generally identical with it, is widely prevalent, more especially in America, but also in this country ; and further, because the attitude towards Reunion which is its outcome is shared by many who would not accept a purely Protestant theory of history without some dilution. There are Anglicans, for instance, like the Dean of St. Paul's, who hold that the revolution of the sixteenth century shattered for ever the ideal of a visible Christian

unity ; they would presumably hold, with the extremer sort of Protestant, that while the Roman Church must be allowed to go its own unrepentant way, the non-Roman bodies have little to gain from any projects of organic fusion ; and so far at least they share the opinion which would deny to the visible Church any primacy of importance.

Between the two extremes which I have just described, every possible variety of intermediate opinion has its advocates. I would ask consideration for one of these varieties. The Church, on this view, is rightly described as one, holy, catholic and apostolic. All these ' notes ' taken together express the ideal of the New Testament. The New Testament knows nothing of sheer independency ; nor does it direct the primary attention of Christians towards an invisible Church at all. On the contrary, the local Churches of the Apostolic age were held closely together in organic unity under Apostolic leadership ; and the primary loyalty of Christians was claimed for a visible society, ordered and organised for a manifold variety of functions by the one Spirit of Christ. On the other hand, the actual Church has never, since the early days of the second century, been fully one, any more than it has been entirely holy, completely catholic, or wholly true to the Apostolic ideal. The four ' notes ' of the Church represent in fact the fourfold task of the Church through the ages. As Christianity is called to work out the implications of the Incarnate Life in an ever-varying environment of intellectual apprehension, so also it is called to achieve the infinitely difficult goal of unity, through ever-varying phases of experiment and failure. It can never surrender this vocation without fundamental infidelity. The infidelity of such a surrender would be fundamental because the deepest law of the Church's life is the law of sacrifice, of the Cross : and the law of sacrifice is also the secret of unity. Therefore, to admit that a Catholic Church is

impossible is to say that the spirit of the Cross can never, on this earth, bear final rule over the minds of Christians. To relegate the conception of oneness to the Church invisible is to take an easy path which is essentially un-Christian ; and for this the New Testament affords no warrant at all.

It is thus untrue to suggest that those who hold on, in apparent defiance of hard fact, to the ideal of a visibly unified Church, are dominated by the ideals which died with the Middle Ages. On the contrary, the hope to which they cling so obstinately is that of the New Testament itself. They cannot, indeed, consent to regard the Reformation either as a mere apostasy, begotten by forces external to Catholicism, or as a splendid reversion to the unadulterated Gospel. They regard it rather as an inevitable explosion, generated by forces pent up within the Catholic structure, an explosion whose destructive effects were in some measure compensated, not by any new thing it brought into being, but by its reassertion of essential Christian truths, which the Middle Ages had obscured. They see, in the rise and fall of Caesaro-papism, an attempt to base the unity of the Church upon centralisation and autocracy, an experiment which in the end frustrated itself. And as they look back over the Church's story, they perceive in it more than one similarly frustrated effort : the failure of the attempt to make of the Church a *hortus inclusus* for the righteous, and also, perhaps they would add, the very partial success of the policies which would have maintained it as a *hortus inclusus* of intellectual conformity. If now they are confronted on the one hand with the ideals of autocracy, and on the other with that of sheer formlessness, is it not permissible for them to hope that the choice between Scylla and Charybdis does not exhaust all the possible alternatives ? Is it certain that all the ways towards a unity which shall be truly Catholic have been tried in vain ?

II

The three views which have now been outlined give rise to three possible main lines of practical endeavour. For the purpose of this chapter it will not be necessary to discuss the first of these, which points towards the acceptance of the Roman claims as they now stand. We are concerned with what is now practically possible for English Churchmen, and not even those who think it profitable to examine the loop-holes left in the Vatican Decrees for a benign interpretation would maintain that such an acceptance is within the horizon of practical politics ; nor can the vision of a reformed Papacy, such as Friedrich Heiler dreams of in his great book on Catholicism, be rightly discussed under this head. There remain for consideration those policies which either make directly towards ' federalism,' as a final goal, or are at least in sympathy with its negations and hopes, and those which definitely envisage corporate reunion as an ultimate possibility.

The case for discarding the ideal of organic unity, and for seeking only a freer co-operation of the existing denominational unity, is in some ways very strong. Its strength, however, lies in its obvious correspondence with the facts as they are, rather than in its attractiveness as an ideal or in its relation to ultimate Christian principles. The cleavage between Catholic and Protestant is deep ; it is easy to infer that it can never be bridged. Each of the severed Protestant communities has its own vigorous life and its own tenacious traditions ; and while it is true that hardly any of them would now claim the infallibility which in the sixteenth century each Protestant reconstruction held itself to possess, they are all in some measure self-contained and self-sufficient. Why then should they not be content to follow their own parallel lines of development, in mutual recognition, and united only in the Lord whom they separately serve ? There might thus

emerge, not indeed a spiritually united Christendom, but at least a vast and loosely coherent league of non-Catholic Christians, within which there would be free intercommunion and frank co-operation in all good works. The formation of such a league would encounter no insuperable difficulties, and it would have the practical advantages which come from accepting things as they are.

There are Anglicans not a few who would be content in the main with such hopes as these. Such men would accept the great disruption of Western Christendom as final ; and while they would not desire to obliterate the special relation of our Church to the Catholic tradition of continuity, and would regard with sympathy the movement towards a *rapprochement* between our Church and the Orthodox East, they would prefer to remain in total estrangement from the Church of Rome. The organic union of Christendom is, therefore, for them an utterly idle dream and one which obscures the more practical vision of a regime of general Protestant toleration. Further, outside our own communion there is a very large body of Protestant sentiment, far larger than is usually realised, which tends in the same direction ; and at this moment it is greatly reinforced by the difficulties which emerge, here and across the Atlantic, wherever the Reunion movement is attempting to translate itself into practice. It is likely to assert itself even more strongly in the near future.

The case against ' federalism ' is simply this, that however attractive it may be as indicating the line of least resistance, it is profoundly unsatisfying to deep Christian instincts. The innumerable sects, added together, do not make a Christian Church ; and federalism is little more than a process of addition. Moreover, it is only the addition of items each of which, taken by itself, is imperfectly Christian, and it is such an addition as would leave the imperfection of each unit untouched. Protestantism is not Christianity ; nor is Anglicanism,

nor the religion of the Baptist or Methodist. These are all limited and gravely imperfect modes of discipleship, forms which ought to perish if they refuse to grow out towards a higher and fuller life. The danger of 'federalism' is that it would simply promote the unmodified survival of inadequate types, and afford no stimulus towards the emergence of a richer form of life. A general 'federalising' of purely Protestant bodies is doubtless a practical possibility; but in such a movement Anglicanism could have no direct interest, nor is there any ground for hoping that it would bear within itself the seeds of true progress. Probably it would lead to the extinction of higher hopes in a diffused and unprogressive complacency.

'Federalism' has also the inherent defect that it is too cheap. It involves a *minimum* of sacrifice, and thus evades the central principle of Christian duty. Isolation is comfortable; the possession of peculiar treasures of tradition appeals to the natural man; but the comfort of the natural man is the last object that the Christian spirit can allow itself to pursue. It cost something for Jew and Gentile to find each other in the one Church, and the price was worth paying. It costs nothing for the varying denominational traditions to subsist side by side; it would cost much for them to be converted into real contributions to the manifold life of our Church, and it is a deep Christian instinct that urges us to believe in the value of such a sacrifice.

Unconvinced, therefore, by the attractions of the easier way, we turn to consider the prospects and difficulties of another road. If it is towards Reunion that our Church ought to move, or rather if it ought to endorse and promote the actual movements towards corporate Reunion which are now in progress, what immediate tasks lie before us in relation to the problems which have already been encountered, and how can we best promote the general growth of the spirit which makes for unity?

The first *agendum*, and the most important at this moment, is the awakening of the English people to an acute dissatisfaction with the actual facts of division. The absence or feebleness of such discontent has hampered all the efforts which have hitherto been made in the direction of constitutional readjustment, and has tended to obscure the difficulties which underlie them. The leaders of the Free Churches and of our own communion are a long way ahead of their constituents. Assuming the principle of Reunion as granted, they have naturally approached it on its constitutional side, and have asked what removable causes, in the sphere of order, sever the Free Churches from Anglicans. The world outside has been informed of the course which their discussions have taken, but has paid little attention to the conviction underlying them. The leaders, vividly conscious of the evils of disunion at home and abroad, have striven to discover a cure for them ; the rank and file are not really awake to these evils, nor have they begun to regard their removal as a matter of vital importance.

No one could deliberately suppose that any formula of concord would of itself avail to bring about a living union between living Churches. Recent experience in Canada shows how precarious such a union would be, and how certain it is that reunion on the basis of a formula will always have a minority at least unreconciled. In Scotland, on the other hand, the wise and minutely careful negotiations which are now bringing about the unity of Presbyterianism rest upon a broad basis of general desire, while the Methodists of our own country, who are attempting a relatively simple task of fusion, are acutely conscious of the danger which attends any other procedure. It is possible that if the tide of mutual sympathy between two bodies rose high, the discovery of a formal basis of union might cause a tidal wave in which all discussion would be submerged. But the tide must flow strongly first.

It follows, therefore, that the primary need of the moment is the awakening of the rank and file. They need to learn, first of all, what our disunion really means, and how inadequate the severed Churches are, in their isolation, to embody the mind of Christ. The opponents of reunion are very largely justified in their contention that there is no general demand for such a movement ; but Christian teachers had better be silent if they propose only to speak of those things for which there is a general demand. It is their business now to shake the complacency of their people. They are accustomed to dwell upon the contribution which their own body has made to the totality of Christian experience ; it is time for them to pass beyond this theme, and dwell rather upon the treasures which others possess, thinking less of what has been achieved through their own Church, and more of what might be achieved if its treasures were merged in a larger fund.

Such teaching will meet with strong resistance. The streams of religious interest and usage have cut for themselves deeply marked channels, and however parallel their course may be, the waters run apart. Their separateness affects the life of the people as a whole ; it issues in social cleavage, limiting and hampering the formation of friendships, it creates and maintains antipathies. But it has worked its way into the heart of English life, and to modify it seriously may be the work of generations.

Yet is it not possible for our lay-people to be drawn along the path which their leaders have opened up ?

I would have our people candidly told what common Anglicanism lacks, and also what it has to give. I would have them envy and admire what lies outside their enclosure ; the fervour, the simplicity, the militancy of some Churches, the devotional wealth of others. They should learn discontent ; they should come to see that it is futile to speak of different Churches as ministering to different temperaments, and that

the virtues of each Church, as things are, tend to remain where they are, unable to propagate themselves at all across the barriers of separation. They should see that we are the poorer for all that our neighbours possess and cannot pass on, and they the poorer for what we treasure and cannot communicate to them.

As yet, however, the tide of discontent and desire, though it has begun to flow, has no substantial volume. A great deal of education and conversion needs to be done, both in our own Church and in others, before the sacrifices which Reunion would require can be willingly offered.

At every point, indeed, the chief necessity of the Reunion movement is educational. Eager as we may be to translate our desires into action, we must realise that the sphere within which action is possible is limited, and we must bear the resulting strain upon our patience. We are hampered by the many-sidedness of the claims to which we are obliged to be loyal. A Church which is at one and the same time entering into ever-closer fellowship with the Orthodox East, discussing the possibilities of reconciliation with the Free Churches, and unofficially conversing with Roman Catholic theologians, is necessarily embarrassed by the wealth of its own opportunities. It would be the height of unwisdom if by impulsive action in any one direction we were to diminish these opportunities in another. There is, indeed, no direction in which general schemes of intercommunion, or an unrestricted interchange of preachers, are likely to be of permanent value. It would indeed be of service to ourselves, and to the Free Churches, if such an interchange for the definite purpose of mutual explanation upon the difficulties of reunion were widely encouraged by authority. Premature acts of intercommunion, on the other hand, are apt to beg too many questions, and end always in defeating the purpose of charity which prompts them. A stage may be reached when something analogous

to the Orthodox principle of 'economy' may be naturalised among us, and if such a principle were recognised we should be able to exercise Christian hospitality at our altars without fearing the loss of charity and of dignity in which unauthorised adventures at present occasionally involve us. But this is a matter for the whole Church, and not for individual pioneers.

The field for educational work, however, is wide enough to absorb all our energies. What our ordinary parish laity and clergy have to do has already been suggested. And already we have students and observers who are exploring other areas in many directions. Movements in Germany among Christians of every sort are yielding a copious literature, and something, but not enough, is being done to keep our Church in sympathetic touch with them. The correspondence-files of the World Conference on Faith and Order are convincing proof that the movement towards Reunion is, geographically at least, oecumenical. Over eighty religious communions are pledged to take part in its meeting at Lausanne in 1927, and the vastness of the undertaking, while it diminishes the prospect of concrete results, is a proof that the task in which our Church is called to share is one of world-wide importance. We need a far larger body of observers who will follow its progress in all the continents of the world.

Meanwhile, the argument which has the most immediate claim on our attention is that which started from the Lambeth Appeal. The progress of that argument can best be followed in the volumes of documents edited by the Dean of Canterbury. I would urge that those who study this piece of history should use large maps. If it is viewed with narrow vision, its results will probably be dismissed with summary injustice ; but if it is realised that we are here dealing with very great issues, with conceptions of the Church and its nature which have matured—and diverged—

for centuries, with communities which have grown old in separation, and with antitheses which go very deep into the heart of religion, the verdict of the onlooker will be very different. In particular, it is wholly misleading to suppose that the discussions have merely reached a point at which there is nothing more to be said. On the contrary, they have simply reached a point at which it is imperative to go forward, and to re-think certain fundamentals in the light of the indubitable gains which discussion has achieved.

These discussions present two main aspects. On the one side they have involved the consideration of our actual agreements, and an estimate of the extent of our existing unity in belief. On this side there is no ground for discouragement. We meet in a common acknowledgment of God in Christ which may well afford the basis of dogmatic concord, and makes it clear, at the very least, that our main difficulties do not lie in the sphere of fundamental faith. On the other side, they have involved the consideration of the things in which we differ, and an explanation of the possibilities of reconciliation. Here it has become clear that some of the non-Anglican participants were prepared to move more readily than the bodies to which they belong. Propositions which were accepted at Lambeth, dealing with the nature of the Church, and the necessity of a universally recognised ministry, have since been quite clearly repudiated by the Baptist Union in this country. And grave difficulty has arisen among those who still accept them, as to the methods by which they could be put into practice. The difficulty turns, in the main, round a hypothetical case. If it should be agreed, for the sake of unity, that the practice at least of the episcopal ordination of all ministers should become universal, and that this would carry with it a general acknowledgment of the validity of the Sacraments dispensed by such a ministry, what would be the position of

ministers already ordained to the Free Church ministries as they are? The difficulty is obviously one which, if it ever arose, would pass out of existence in one generation; but although many solutions of it have been proposed, none has as yet been suggested which appears to command the assent of Anglicans and Free Churchmen alike.

The Free Church position is quite unambiguous. If every Christian minister in the world were episcopally ordained, the ministry as a whole, it would argue, would be no more 'valid' than it is now. Free Church ministries have been admitted to be real ministries within the Catholic Church; and if they possess this degree of reality, they cannot need any augmentation. Yet it is suggested that the Free Church ministers of the interim period ought to receive a fresh commission which would amount to re-ordination, while Anglicans would not require anything of the kind, although they might receive a formal recognition which would stamp their ministrations as acceptable within the present area of the Free Churches. The bargain is one-sided. Anglicanism claims all and concedes nothing. The proposed fresh commission would involve, for Free Churchmen, such a slur upon their ordination as would amount practically to a repudiation of its validity.

III

Thus the argument stands now. But the appearance of finality which it presents is illusory. For brevity's sake, let me confine myself to one or two points upon which further patient enquiry is called for.

One large issue claims to be faced with candour. Speaking very broadly, it is plain that Anglicanism stands for continuity and the Free Churches for its opposite. By this I would not be understood to mean either that our tradition can make no room for the

breaking out of fresh light and truth, or that the Free Churches rest upon a blank repudiation of all that lies between the New Testament and the Reformation ; but rather that all Free Church structures of organisation are attempts at a *re-creation* of the Church, whereas our own rests upon a deliberate abstention from any attempt at a fundamental recommencement. Any fusion between structures which differ in this way would necessarily involve such a reintegration of ' continuous ' and ' discontinuous ' elements as would bear the appearance of a surrender on the part of the latter. Churches deriving their origin from a fresh start, in the sixteenth century or later, would become one with a Church which claims unity with the unbroken tradition of Catholicism, and the resulting unity would in some sense leave the principle of discontinuity behind. The sacrifice which Free Churchmen might be called upon to make consists essentially in this : and it appears to be one-sided. Yet it is balanced by other considerations. It would involve, for Anglicans, no definite surrender in the sphere of order : but it would require from them a tolerance and charity in the sphere of usage which would cost them much ; and while there is no calculus subtle enough to determine the relative cost of acts of love, it is certain that the account would not be as one-sided as it has been supposed to be.

Yet, when the problem of the ministry is under discussion, the suspicion and fear of one-sidedness are never absent. In part, it arises from the logic of the situation just indicated, and is inevitable. But in part, I would urge, it is removable ; and it is possible that a full re-examination of the notion of *validity* might help to remove it.

The word *valid*, as applied to a ministry or a sacrament, has a double connotation ; it is both active and passive. Attention has commonly been given only to the active side, on which it suggests the idea of *efficacy*. Thus the question whether certain minis-

tries are ' valid ' has been taken merely as implying a doubt as to what those ministries effect ; whether, for instance, they are capable of ministering real sacraments. A doubt of this nature is a very damaging thing ; and a direct denial of the active validity of any ordained person's ministrations must always be felt to infringe the limits alike of Christian charity and of human knowledge. The present tension between Anglican and Free Church leaders on the subject of the ministry is largely due to the feeling that we doubt the active validity of their ministries ; and Free Churchmen on their side are so convinced of the reality of their own ordinations, and of the spiritual results which have flowed from them, that they cannot imagine how any ministries could be more ' valid ' than experience shows their own to be.

The word ' valid,' however, has another aspect which in this context is of the highest importance. It has the passive notion of reliability or trustworthiness. Its ancient Greek equivalent is the word *βέβαιος*, which means ' firm,' ' assured,' something on which a man can take his stand. When St. Ignatius, in the second century, speaks of a Eucharist celebrated by a bishop or his deputy as *βεβαία*, he means that it is one in which the faithful can partake without any misgiving as to the conditions under which it is celebrated.

Now an overwhelming *consensus* of Christian tradition, practically unquestioned for some fifteen centuries, did establish in the mind of the Church the conviction that in order to be fully reliable all sacramental acts, including ordination, must conform to certain simple terms of continuity. To those terms the Free Church ministries do not in fact conform. And if the conception of trustworthiness, or, to use a more objective word, ' trustedness,' is kept in mind, it is obvious that all our ministries, Anglican and Free Church alike, possess only a very limited range

of validity in this passive sense. For while it is presumptuous to fasten upon any Christian ministry the stigma of active invalidity, it is mere common sense to observe that the range over which it is trusted, or, according to established standards, trustworthy, is very far from being co-extensive with the Church as a whole.

Personally, I could wish that in this sense our own ministry were very much more 'valid' than it is; nor should I feel the least reluctance towards accepting any act of enlarged authorisation which would extend it over a wider field. The notion that such an act would necessarily carry with it any slur upon a previous and more limited ordination seems to me fundamentally unreal. Yet, from the nature of the case, any such enlarged authorisations, if accepted by various types of ministers, would necessarily vary in detail, since what one Church would require of another, in order to secure the entire 'trustedness' of mutually recognised ministries, could not in all cases be the same. If, however, there should ever be a large movement in this direction, recognised as fundamentally identical under various modes, and as having the one aim of securing a universally trusted ministry, the invidiousness of distinctions within the one movement would surely be submerged altogether.

The meaning and use of the word 'validity' is thus one of the points, apparently minute but really important, which open up a wide road of further enquiry. For my present purpose it is needless to follow it further. It has been dwelt upon here, simply because it is one of the many points which show that the home-reunion argument has none of the symptoms of an exhausted controversy. It is, rather, an argument in which we must be content to return again and again, if need be, to the examination of first principles, and to the work of clarifying the terms which we employ. The responses, positive and negative, which the Lambeth Appeal has evoked, make it plain that a

thorough scrutiny of the sacramental character of the Church, and of all that is meant by ordination, is the next *agendum* for those who desire to carry forward what has been begun.

The cause which we seek to promote has formidable rivals : it has only one really dangerous enemy. The spirit of disunion and the spirit of self-complacency are one and the same thing. It is easy enough to see how they beset other Churches, and especially those which claim any form of infallibility, whether Catholic or Protestant. It is harder, and more salutary, to discern their hardening influence upon ourselves. To foster such discernment, through the exercise of candour and humility, and the disciplined search for truth, is the chief business of those whose desires are towards the unity of the Body of Christ.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN THE EMPIRE AND IN OTHER LANDS

BY THE REV. F. GARFIELD WILLIAMS,
O.B.E., M.B., B.S.

(Canon of St. Albans; Secretary of the Missionary Council of the National Church Assembly)

SYNOPSIS

The Missionary tradition of the Anglican Church. The origin and growth of the Society method in the overseas work of the Church. The growth of Empire a determining factor in the expansion of the Church of England. The decadent Church life of the eighteenth century and its influence on the overseas work of the Church . . . . . pp. 199–203

I. The Evangelical revival and the new spirit of the nineteenth century. The unsympathetic attitude to missions of the official leadership of the Church in the first part of the nineteenth century and its subsequent change . . . . . ,, 203–207

II. The increasing co-operation between various groups in the extension of the Kingdom and its importance for this particular age. The past achievement of the accredited Missionary Societies of the Church and their present need . . . . . ,, 207–215

III. A forward look—hopes and fears . . . ,, 212–215

IX

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION IN THE EMPIRE AND IN OTHER LANDS

The missionary tradition of the Anglican Church stretches far back. St. Patrick in the fifth century, St. Columba in the sixth century, Columban, Willibrord and Boniface in the seventh and eighth centuries form an essential part of that tradition. We recognise no gulf as separating the missionary spirit of our Church to-day from that which informed its whole life in the centuries before the Reformation. The Church in England has a great tradition of missionary zeal behind it. There are certain places which are sacred to the cause of foreign missions. If France has its Tours we in Britain have our own Iona and Canterbury. It would do us good in these days to go on pilgrimage again to our own holy places. We cannot rightly estimate the nature and development of modern missionary effort unless we examine its links with the past and treasure that past.

It was really the formation of the monastic orders in mediaeval times that predetermined the Church's use of missionary societies in the work of the evangelisation of the world. The critic of the society method must deal with St. Benedict and St. Maur, St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominic, Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier, before he can successfully attack the founders of the S.P.G. and the C.M.S. or the other Anglican Missionary Societies. For the great societies of the Anglican Church are in the direct succession of the monastic orders. The Reformation brought about *per saltum* changes in our Church organisation, and very probably we leapt too far and in some things would do

well to retrace our steps ; and it may be that before they are done our missionary societies will in some of their work approximate more nearly than they do now to the monastic orders of old. What prevents some of this approximation now is that we have allowed party spirit in the Church to warp our judgment in these things.

An intermediate step between the method of the monastic orders and the society method as we have developed it is seen in the great Roman Catholic Paris Society for Foreign Missions, founded in 1650, and in the work of its great leaders Pallu and Lambert in the Far East. Among our fellow Christians of the Roman communion since the days of the founding of the Paris society, the society method has been adopted with great vigour and success, and if the Roman genius demands and produces, in the Congregation of the Propaganda, a greater and more effective centralisation than we have achieved in the Anglican communion, yet we too have at long last recognised the necessity of some central body through which our Anglican societies could, if they so desired, act co-operatively, first in our formation of a Central Board of Missions, and now in a Missionary Council of our National Church Assembly. It is at least a debatable point whether the English genius would ever do its best work in so rigidly centralised a system of foreign missions control as pertains in the Roman communion, and seems congenial at least to the Latin members of that Church. In mediaeval times the Crusades deflected into wrong channels the foreign missionary zeal of the Church in Britain as in all Europe. We have not yet lived down their effects either upon our own Church life or upon our witness to the Moslem world. They were nothing short of a disaster to the cause of missions, and but for the monastic orders must have been a final disaster for the Church. But in these monastic orders the missionary spirit survived

on the continent of Europe and grew to large fruition in post-Reformation times.

It was, however, the growth of empire, not the missionary motive, which in post-Reformation days determined the expansion of the Church of England, and it was the State or the companies which acted in lieu of the State, not the Church, which in the first two centuries of empire-building took the lead in such expansion. In the first century of that expansion—the seventeenth century—it was taken for granted that where the Englishman went he took with him his religion. It went without saying that groups of settlers in the new plantations would build themselves churches and make arrangements for the regular services of the Church. Moreover, there seems to have been recognised by these early settlers a duty on their part to evangelise the heathen with whom they came into contact, though we must not imagine that their methods of evangelisation would commend themselves to our modern ideas. Four causes seem, however, to have operated to make this work of evangelisation largely a dead letter. First, the clergy in the plantations had their hands full with their ministration to their own people in struggling colonies ; secondly, the constant fighting with the various warlike heathen tribes with whom the Western settlers came in contact operated against any effective evangelisation; and thirdly, as the State became progressively more irreligious, so its desire to evangelise the heathen or even to provide adequate ministrations for the settlers became less marked ; and fourthly, explain it as we may, the fact remains that the Reformation definitely stayed the progress of the evangelisation of the heathen, for the reformed Church was not so interested in the heathen as was the unreformed Church.

Two causes operated to lessen the disastrous consequences of this decreasing interest in the propagation of the faith. In the first place, religious persecution

in England forced religious men to seek safety in the plantations ; and in the second place, clergy who had seen the need in the plantations succeeded in bringing into existence towards the beginning of the eighteenth century, first the S.P.C.K. and then the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This latter society for more than a century was working almost wholly among our own people who were colonising the Western Hemisphere, and by its work in the American colonies, before the War of Independence, it succeeded in laying the foundations of what is now the Episcopal Church in America, and of subsequently developing the Anglican Church in British North America, Central America and the West Indies.

It is a misuse of the expression ' Missionary Society ' in the sense we now use it to describe either the S.P.G. or the earlier society, the S.P.C.K., as missionary societies before the nineteenth century. With the exception of one abortive attempt by the S.P.G. in West Africa neither of these societies sent out a single British missionary to the heathen before the nineteenth century. The truth is that by the middle of the eighteenth century, whatever may have been the case earlier, the leaders of the Anglican Church had ceased to believe in missions to the heathen. It is therefore still more to the credit of the directors of the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G. in those early days that, in spite of their association with an essentially irreligious State, they did help to finance Danish and German missions in India, and did send out men who were many of them really missionary-hearted clergy, to work among our own people overseas. The S.P.G. in particular stood for all that was best where there was comparatively little that was good in the Anglican Church of the eighteenth century. But apart from its income from endowments, at the close of the century it was only raising a few hundred pounds a year for its work.

It is easy to give evidence of the decadence of the

Anglican Church in the eighteenth century, but there is surely no more striking evidence of this than the fact that at a time when her sons were spreading the Empire throughout the world she seems to have cared next to nothing for the evangelisation of the heathen, and the very few among her members who did so care were content to pay Danish and German missionaries to do the work for them. That there were Danish and German missionaries who were prepared to do the work, and in actual fact did do the work with a heroism that has seldom since been equalled, was of course due to the Pietist movement in Central Europe, whose chief ornament was the amazing Moravian Church, which is still the most missionary-hearted Christian community in the world. The orthodox Lutheran Church of the eighteenth century was as dead as the orthodox Anglican Church. It is difficult for us to-day to realise the state of affairs that existed towards the end of the eighteenth century. The French Revolution had for the time being practically destroyed the work of the great Roman Catholic Paris Society for Foreign Missions. The American War of Independence had terminated the work of the S.P.G. in the American Colonies, though it was still doing good work in British North America, Central America and the West Indies. The East India Company, in spite of the Christian witness of Charles Grant, had ceased to approve of any kind of missionary work. The first foreign mission started by the S.P.G. in West Africa had come to an untimely end. The State had ceased to care about religion either at home or abroad. Seldom has there been a darker period in the history of the Church. Then came the Evangelical revival.

I

In these days we sometimes hear people decrying the work of missionary societies and demanding that the Church should become her own missionary

society. The fact is that, but for the growth of the great missionary societies in the early part of the nineteenth century, the expansion of our Church along with the expansion of Empire would have been an impossibility, and to-day the Anglican Church would have been an insignificant remnant of a once mighty missionary force. The missionary societies in actual fact saved the Anglican Church. These societies had to struggle for their lives. It is seldom realised that until Bishop Heber's day Indian Bishops would have nothing to do with the Church Missionary Society. They did not approve of missionary work. It was not that they approved of one society and not of another, for the S.P.G. can hardly have been said to have become a distinctively missionary agency until the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and certainly at that time was making no attempt to send out missionaries to India. In South Africa as late as 1848 Bishop Gray was speaking of 'the reproach hitherto attaching to the Church of England for being almost the only community of Christians which had not attempted to establish missions among the multitude of the heathen.' Even the C.M.S. missionaries were all Germans until 1815. There seem to have been none of our own people in the Anglican Church in those days forthcoming for missionary work overseas, though there were people of the type of Carey, Marshman, Ward, Morrison, Moffat and Williams among the British Nonconformists.

But the Evangelical revival, which brought the C.M.S. into existence and gave the S.P.G. a new lease of life, even before it brought these changes about in the early part of the nineteenth century had already made such changes in the personnel of the Church's clergy overseas as served to pave the way for the future missionary work of the societies, for it had already succeeded in getting men of the Henry Martyn type to go overseas as chaplains.

It is impossible to give a date for the change of attitude to foreign missions which came over the leaders of the Anglican Church in the nineteenth century. It was a slow process. There is, however, no reason to doubt that it had its origin in the Evangelical revival and was greatly stimulated by the awakening of the national conscience on the subject of the Slave Trade. Nobody doubts now that it was the little group of Evangelicals, some of whom were responsible for bringing the C.M.S. into existence, that did more than any other body to bring about the change in the Anglican Church, though they were not loved any the more at the time for doing it. It is a hopeful sign of the times in which we live that men are prepared now to be honest about these things. If the S.P.G. kept the principle of the Church's responsibility for the heathen from absolute neglect in the eighteenth century, it was the C.M.S. which in the first half of the nineteenth century made that principle a dominant conception in our Church, and made possible not only her own immense achievement, but that of the S.P.G. and all the other Anglican societies that later in the century took up the work. Nor does any honest Anglican now fail to give the ultimate honour for all this great missionary reawakening to the faith and endeavour of the early Nonconformist evangelists and missionaries. The missionary movement in the nineteenth century started with the rank and file, not with the leaders. This was the chief reason why the S.P.G., which was closely associated with the leaders of the Church, was for a long time at a serious disadvantage. In the first half of the nineteenth century it was no advantage to a group of missionary enthusiasts to be dominated by the English Bishops. Still less was it an advantage for them to be closely associated with the State and to have been incorporated by Royal Charter. The Bishops, with one or two notable exceptions, did not

like the C.M.S. and kindred societies, for such societies would not tolerate their putting a brake on the progress of the Church overseas. But all that is past history. There was too much of deathless heroism and solid achievement in the first sixty years of these rank-and-file societies for the Bishops ultimately to cold-shoulder them. And the last sixty years, and particularly the last thirty years, have seen so great a change that it is hard now to realise how difficult it was for a missionary enthusiast in the early part of the Victorian age to remain a good Anglican and to remember that as he won men to a personal allegiance to Jesus Christ it was part of his task to help to build up a Church overseas in communion with the Anglican Church in the home lands. The gulf which separated the official leadership of the Church from the greater part of the Church's work overseas might have proved impassable, and might have driven the Evangelical societies into the building up of Churches out of communion with the Anglican Church, had it not been for a deep conviction concerning the mission of the Anglican Church to the world which some of the leaders of these societies held, and the general growth of democracy and of education which gradually forced the hierarchy of the Anglican Church to come to terms with the thought and aspiration of the rank and file. Undoubtedly the situation was influenced also by a movement which emerged in the life of the Church at home. The Oxford Movement made most Christian people, including the Evangelicals, think once again about the doctrine of the Church. As the century progressed, Anglicans became not only better churchmen but more human churchmen, and it did not make the divine character of the Church less obvious by its appearing to be more human, any more than God became less God-like in incarnation. By the end of the nineteenth century no Bishop who failed to be a real father to his people had the slightest chance of

carrying any serious weight in the councils of the Church, and any one of them whose conception of the work of our Church was confined to its work in Great Britain or its work merely among people of our own race overseas, was to the High Churchman lacking in Catholicity, to the Low Churchman lacking in evangelistic zeal, and to the Broad Churchman lacking in breadth of vision, and although he might still be innocuous from the point of view of the State, he was seen quite clearly to be dangerous from the point of view of the Church. By the twentieth century non-missionary-hearted Bishops had become completely out of date. If they exist anywhere to-day, which is more than doubtful, they do not really matter. It is interesting moreover to note how this change of attitude on the part of the Bishops of our Church has synchronised with a change of attitude on the part of the leaders of the State. To-day their attitude is one of increasing sympathy with the work of foreign missions. This was unusual in the last century, though there were magnificent examples of it in India in the mid-Victorian age.

II

The twentieth century finds the Anglican Church, alike in its leadership and its rank and file, a Church which conceives its first duty to be the evangelisation of the world. So certainly is this true to-day that we have almost forgotten that this was not so in the previous century.

It is most important to realise the significance of this united front in the prosecution of the foreign missionary enterprise, for it is going to mean a degree of united action that has hitherto been impossible. To-day High Churchmen delight to do honour to the C.M.S. and kindred societies. Evangelicals rejoice in the great achievements of the S.P.G. and other kindred bodies, and both groups have a profound

admiration for the work of the Anglican religious communities and the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. This mutual admiration does not imply any dwindling allegiance to what is distinctive in the respective types of churchmanship for which each group stands. But nobody can deny that mutual admiration is a distinct help in attempts at co-ordination, and there is a growing dislike which is rapidly becoming a passionate repudiation of the attitude which strives to foster the interests of one group by decrying the work of the other. Whenever the majority of churchmen read criticism of this kind in the religious Press, or hear it from the platform, they instinctively recoil from it as something which is beneath the dignity of the English churchman, and altogether at variance with the more Christian spirit of this age.

This is an important sign of the times and it suggests a great hope for the future, for it is going to make possible the spectacle of the whole Anglican Church rejoicing in the missionary achievement of her societies in the past century and united in a determination that their work in the present century shall represent the whole endeavour of the whole Church of England to make Christ known to the nations of all the world.

The moment is propitious—for this age in which we live is a great 'day of the Lord,' veritably a 'fullness of the times' when God is calling His Church out to some larger venture of faith for some tremendous achievement hitherto impossible.

For the first time in history, the Church can see the world which Christ came to redeem, and in the call of the world's need can hear the Call of God challenging her to liberate the spiritual forces which are her heritage for the healing of the nations and the transformation of the kingdoms of the world into the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

The Great European War was a desperate expedient, but it has undoubtedly in some measure helped blind Christians to receive their sight, and to-day as never before Christians do see the whole world in fearful need of that righteousness and peace which they know can alone come to it through Jesus Christ.

As a definite part of the Catholic Church, it is important therefore that the Anglican Church should come to some kind of estimate of its commitments and needs in view of its world task. This estimate of our position is what is being attempted to-day by the Missionary Council of the National Church Assembly. Four reports reviewing the situation have already been published and there are more to follow.

Two facts have already emerged quite clearly. The first is that the work of the accredited missionary societies of the Church of England during the last century was a very fine achievement. It is not merely that the personnel of these societies have exhibited great heroism, single-hearted purpose and a faith which actually removed mountains of difficulty. What is perhaps even more impressive, because possibly less expected, is the realisation of the strategic significance of the work done. As a result of this century of endeavour the Church of England finds itself in a position of quite extraordinary influence overseas. Doubtless in this our missionary societies have been greatly assisted by the Imperial expansion of our people, but this does not appear to have been the chief cause for the strategical importance of our overseas work, for it is just as great without as within the boundaries of our Empire, and in many cases preceded the expansion of Empire.

It is clear that for the most part unrealised by the Church at home, a very remarkable and far-sighted leadership has been developed among our missionaries overseas, and yet in books dealing with the history of the Church in the last century it is rare to find any

reference made to this. The histories of the development of the Church in the nineteenth century that will be written a century hence will tell a different story, and episodes which our historians of to-day have made much of in the life of the Church in the home lands during the last century will be discovered to have little significance in the history of the Church as a whole, whereas the significance of the despised missionary societies and their practically unknown missionaries will by that time have become quite obvious. A reference to our position in Africa will explain the point that we desire to make. Tropical Africa occupies of course an immense area, far more than twice the size of Europe including Russia. In that vast area there have developed certain strategic positions. To mention the five most important. In the West there are the lines of communication which are necessarily formed by the Niger and the Congo. In the East there are the lines of communication now afforded by the Kenya and Uganda and the Tanganyika railways, and down the centre the lines of communication afforded by the upper Nile and the Great Lakes. On four out of five of these important lines of communication the missionaries of the Church of England are entrenched, but what is more significant still is the fact that in every case our missionaries were there before the Western world started seriously to use or develop or create these lines of communication. That suggests strategy of a very high order. This illustration taken from tropical Africa is doubtless the most spectacular, but it is by no means the only one that could have been given. Some of the concentrations of our Anglican work in South Africa are hardly less significant, and in regard to the Moslem world it is almost uncanny how our missionaries seem to-day to be holding most of the points of vantage. The mission hospitals on the North-west Frontier of India are by no means the only examples of this.

The position of our schools and colleges in India afford another example of excellent mission strategy, the formation of Dornakal Diocese in India in quite recent times yet another. And although mission strategy, rightly or wrongly, has been more dependent on the strategy of Empire in the Far East than elsewhere, yet it remains the fact that the position we occupy, for instance in the Dioceses of Singapore and Victoria, Hongkong, are of immense strategical significance. Moreover, a careful study of the present situation overseas will, we believe, suggest that the tactical ability of our missionaries has not been less remarkable than their skill in strategy. There is much room for difference of opinion on this point, and in many cases we must wait for the future to decide the issue, but at any rate the writer of this essay awaits the judgment of the future on this point with confidence, and believes that it will one day be clearly seen that, to take one single example where our missionaries have often been criticised, the emphasis Anglican missions have always placed upon education has been thoroughly sound.

The second fact that has clearly emerged is of a very disquieting character. In spite of the relatively enormous increase of our missionaries during the last hundred years, an increase which is shown by the fact that there are to-day over 2,500 Anglican missionaries overseas, whereas a hundred years ago there were not twenty, the present numbers of missionaries and the present amount of money set apart by the Church for the prosecution of their work are quite inadequate for the accomplishment of the task in hand. A moment's thought will make clear the reasons for this. It is due to the rate of acceleration of change in Africa and the East. Even twenty-five years ago our missionary societies were keeping pace with this change and still everywhere held the initiative ; to-day they are failing to keep pace and they are everywhere

losing the initiative. To take again one single illustration: twenty-five years ago our missionaries were keeping pace with the educational requirements of tropical Africa; to-day they are not, and nothing but a large and immediate increase in staff and finance will conserve and develop the splendid educational work they have commenced out there. Yet it is now admitted on all sides that in tropical Africa the one hope for the future lies in the development of a sound system of really Christian education. It would be easy to multiply examples of this dangerous attenuation of mission staffs at points where rapid development is taking place. In India, for instance, examples are seen in the mass movements among villagers, in the rapidly increasing standards of higher education among caste peoples, and in the new opportunities for work among Moslems. It is essential that somehow or other the Church at home should become cognisant both of the successes of the past and of the dangers of the present in her work overseas. We believe that signs are not wanting that the Church at home is taking a fresh interest in her overseas work, and we are not by any means despairing of the future.

III

It is dangerous to prophesy, but this is what one man, who has seen something of the world's need to-day and has had some opportunity of meeting with all types of men, both leaders and rank and file, in all branches of the Anglican Church seems to see ahead:

I see the whole public opinion of the Church roused to a sense of the need of the world. I see that public opinion reflected in the words and actions of the Church's leaders. I see men overwhelmed by the magnitude of that need and driven to their knees to seek a power which is not of themselves, to meet that

need. I see them together on their knees, and forgetting themselves as they find a new unity in Christ, so that they are content not to think and worship alike if only they can together as brethren kneel in the presence of Christ and together receive His blessing. I see them content each to give up what it seems would hinder his brethren from effectively practising the presence of God. I see a new thoughtfulness of others emerging in the realm of worship ; each thinking first how he can help his brother to find and keep the presence of God and not first thinking of himself. I see the High Churchmen thinking first of Low Churchmen, and Low Churchmen thinking first of High Churchmen, and the Modernist fearing most of all lest he should offend one of Christ's little ones, and out of this thoughtfulness for others I see emerge a larger understanding of all that is vitally true in the particular views of each. I see this new attitude coming not so much by any act of will that it shall come, not so much by organised propaganda to bring it about, as by a mutual absorption in the things of Christ, a fresh realisation of the world Christ came to save, a fresh determination to liberate such spiritual forces as will make that salvation to-day available for all the world. I see the missionary societies of the Church coming together just as individual churchmen come together, not by sacrificing what to each seems essential, but by forgetting their battle-cries as they cry out to God in this time of need. It is as they do this that I see them coming nearer together. I do not see them losing their own individuality, for individual temperament is a fundamental thing, but I do see them each rejoicing in the enlargement of the work of groups of peoples temperamentally different from themselves. I see these groups discovering more and more points of contact, and more and more opportunities for co-operative action, and I see them beginning to doubt the essential character of any work where there can be

no co-operation between them in prayer. I see this new-found unity in the work of the Church overseas reacting on the Church at home, as the Church, losing its own life, at last finds its larger life in a complete dedication of its members to the service of others. With this will come a new realisation of the honour of being called to minister to Christ's flock. Our theological colleges will be filled with men with a vocation to minister to others, and to give their lives to the service of Christ and His Church wherever God calls them to serve, and with all this prayer and personal service I see a fresh dedication of the wealth of England to the extension of the Church of Christ.

I cannot see this as something only affecting the Anglican Church. It must result, as I see it, in the destruction of denominationalism conceived of as a thing in itself to be proud of. But I also see almost infinite temperamental variation in the expression of the religious consciousness and in methods of worship, though in this I cannot see any room for denominationalism or of party spirit ; such things will be lost as we become enveloped in an atmosphere of prayer. As all this comes about I see Africa owning allegiance to Christ, the Indian at last finding the religious longings of centuries satisfied in Christ, the peoples of the Far East finding their truest freedom from the domination of what is bad in their own past and of much that is bad that comes to them to-day from the Western world by accepting the Lordship of Christ, and I see all the peoples of the world bringing the treasures of their life and thought and traditions into the vast treasuries of the Church. I think I see this movement beginning now, and I expect soon to see all the forces of evil concentrating upon it in order to make it abortive. What these forces of evil will strive to do is to make us think of ourselves and our own needs and to forget others and their needs. And they will try to convince us that what is needed is not so much more and

better prayer as new organisation, new methods of work, new this and new that, and there will be so much that is true in what they say that we shall find it hard to combat them, for there has got to be so much that is new. They are right there, but the only way to discover the new is to find it in the atmosphere of prayer and self-less service, for it will only truly come to us as an illumination of the Holy Spirit. If we can but forget ourselves and daily widen our vision of the need of the world about us, and see that world as God sees it, and if we can relate all our endeavours to meet that need to the energy of prayer, then we shall attain, and the twentieth century will witness, the Anglican Church losing itself and finding the Kingdom of Heaven, and this will be the greatest century of its history.

THE ASPECT AND THE PROSPECT

BY THE RIGHT REV. F. T. WOODS, D.D.
(Bishop of Winchester)

SYNOPSIS

Humility and hopefulness of the Church at the present day. Elements of possible tragedy, yet of great opportunity. Contribution of the Church of England to the realisation of the Creed—'One Catholic and Apostolic Church' . . . . . pp. 219–220

I. The first note (omitted in the Creed): 'Holy.' Decline of 'otherworldliness'—yet the Church the New Human Race—with corresponding character. Otherwise Baptism meaningless, and Church life ineffective . . . . . ,, 220–223

II. The second note: 'Catholic.' Modern movements in this direction: (1) The quest for truth, and the unity of truth. (2) The desire for a larger fellowship abroad; at home, particularly in industry. (3) Growing desire for fellowship in the Church itself . . . . . ,, 224–242

III. The third note: 'Apostolic.' The Apostolic Succession in history must be complemented by an Apostolic Succession in faith and sacrifice . . ,, 242–244

X

THE ASPECT AND THE PROSPECT

'PREACH the Kingdom of God in its sublimity, in all its range and all its glorious hopes, show us it is something for us all, call us all to live and work for it, enlist us all in the service of the Master, and make Him living, concrete and appealing. Do not offer us "Church privileges" or tell us that we ought to go to Church. Charge us rather with Church responsibilities. Show us God as the King of all the world; bid us consecrate ourselves and act and live. Then I believe you will find that the Church of England has a place she has never held before.'

Thus Professor Barry, in a book[1] which may well be pondered in these post-War days, sums up the hopes of that vast phalanx of our army which was labelled Church of England. That this still represents the aspirations of those best qualified to interpret the Church's mind is plain from the Essays in this volume, representing, as they certainly do, the thoughts of great numbers who, though in most cases quite inarticulate, are deeply anxious for the Church's welfare. We are, I think, humble and hopeful. This has been our attitude in the main since the National Mission of Repentance and Hope began to pierce the shell of our conventionality and to shake us out of the ruts in which we had been too prone to move. For there is hope of a Church which will face frank criticism and even confession of failure. Such an attitude indeed is essential if we are to understand and respond to the opportunities of the immediate future. In the nature of the case these Essays can only give a brief outline of the situation, yet the reader can hardly escape the conviction that the stage is set for great

[1] *The Church in the Furnace*, edited by F. B. MacNutt, p. 66. (Macmillan.)

acts. The elements of tragedy are there, but also the elements of a great and God-inspired achievement. Will the actors be forthcoming? What qualities will the Church need if she is to fulfil the purpose of God in this eventful time? My business is in some sense to sum up and to draw into a focus the preceding chapters, and to this end I set in the forefront the proposition to which every churchman subscribes almost every Sunday of his life—'I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church.' That is the ideal; that is the fact in the mind and intention of God. What contribution can our Church make to its realisation?

I

I draw attention first to the word which is not but ought to be in our version of the Creed, the word 'holy.' This must be the first note of any branch of the Catholic Church if it is to fulfil its destiny. Perhaps the gravest heresy of the Western world during this last century has been the belief that the highest function of man is to work his will upon people and things outside him; that he can change the world without changing himself.[1] This heresy has infected the Church, and the temptation on all sides is to estimate its efficiency in terms of activity and enterprise rather than by the quality of life which is shown in its members and by which they affect their surroundings. It is certain that in this infection of holiness lay the attractive power of the Church in its earliest days. Readers will remember the fine description of this in the so-called Apology of Aristides. Describing the Christians of his day he uses words which it is worth while to ponder:

'And these are they who more than all the nations on the earth have found the truth. For they know God, the Creator

[1] *The Times* Literary Supplement, March 15, 1917.

and Fashioner of all things through the only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit; and beside Him they worship no other God. They have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts; and they observe them, looking forward to the resurrection of the dead and the life in the world to come. They do not commit adultery nor fornication, nor bear false witness, nor covet the things of others; they honour father and mother, and love their neighbours; they judge justly, and they never do to others what they would not wish to happen to themselves; they appeal to those who injure them, and try to win them as friends; they are eager to do good to their enemies; they are gentle and easy to be entreated; they abstain from all unlawful conversation and from all impurity; they despise not the widow, nor oppress the orphan; and he that has, gives ungrudgingly for the maintenance of him who has not.

'If they see a stranger, they take him under their roof, and rejoice over him as over a very brother; for they call themselves brethren not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

'And they are ready to sacrifice their lives for the sake of Christ; for they observe His commandments without swerving, and live holy and just lives, as the Lord God enjoined upon them.'

This quality of holiness is still the secret of the Church's power, and it is not difficult to call to mind characters in which it has been pre-eminently manifested. Men like Newman, or Edward King of Lincoln, or Handley Moule of Durham, or Henry Scott Holland; women like Catharine Marsh and Josephine Butler and Sister Cecilia. It depends upon attitudes of life which are essential in Christianity, but which continually tend to be relegated to the background of Church life. I think, for instance, of that 'other-worldliness' which certainly is not a characteristic of the present day. An acute observer of public life before the War used words which set one thinking deeply if not furiously.

'I think there can be no doubt that apart from any questions of future revival, present belief in religion, as a conception of

life dependent upon supernatural sanctions or as a revelation of a purpose and meaning beyond the actual business of the day, is slowly but steadily fading from the modern city race. Tolerance, kindliness, sympathy, civilisation continually improve. Affirmation of any responsibility beyond that to self and to humanity, continually declines. Life therefore gradually ceases to be influenced or coloured by any atmosphere of "otherworldliness." '[1]

If that be true, and it would take a bold man to deny it, it means that the sanctions upon which are based that tolerance, kindliness, and sympathy of which the writer speaks, are slowly but surely disappearing from view, like shining peaks fading in the mist. For there is no guarantee that these excellent qualities will persist apart from the faith which originally gave them their impetus. In other words, the Church must face the fact that what with the bustle and racket of parochial life, what with her laudable interest and energy in all that concerns social life, she has been tempted to forget the silent foundations of character. They are there, but they need to be freshly discovered. The Evangelicals of last century had grave limitations, but at least they saw life in the vista of the eternal, and that is a point of view which we dare not let go.

For the Church is the result of an act of God aimed at the creation of a new human race. The great truth of evolution in the natural world is here full of suggestion.

Man partly is and wholly hopes to be.

To the Christian indeed the whole regime of the world is at once the starting point and the scaffolding for the building of the new spiritual society which is to inherit the future. And the new society is in the nature of the case anything but at home in this life. The very writing of that sentence, I may remark in

[1] C. F. G. Masterman, *The Condition of England*, p. 266.

parenthesis, shows how far we have drifted from this 'other-worldliness,' for the members of the Church do not as a rule give the impression of being strangers and pilgrims, or of seeking a city which is to come. Yet baptism is meaningless unless it is the inauguration of life in this new society, in fact a rebirth ; and unless the member of the society is thereby committed to an entirely different scale of values from that to which the world is ordinarily accustomed. Further, this character, fashioned according to Christ's values and answering to the 'other-worldly' outlook, is only formed and maintained by contacts with the supernatural and the eternal. It is the core of the Church's faith that God has gone out of His way (if we may speak humanly) to make this contact. 'Immanuel' He is, once in Bethlehem and Galilee and Jerusalem ; now, by His spirit, in the new society which He is creating and in the heart and mind of every believer. This contact with God is continuous, but it has its supreme moments, its sensitive points. These are the sacraments, and, in lesser degree, every method or moment in which the material becomes the vehicle and avenue of the spiritual—the spoken word, or the great cathedral, or the inspiring music, or the uplifting picture. In the result the Church is a company of persons in the present possession of eternal life ; that is, a life supernatural in its source, supernormal in its quality, and as much above the ordinary level of character as St. Paul's great catalogue of the fruits of the Spirit is above the level of ordinary respectability. It is well perhaps to set these elementary facts in the forefront, for if the Church—and therefore the Church of England—is not this, and her members are not thus in touch with the eternal, then she is not fulfilling God's intention. She may be an energetic and admirable association, but she will not be the Body of Christ.

II

I pass to the second note of the Church, and therefore of the Church of England, namely the note of Catholicity. He must be blind to the signs of the times who does not see that the Spirit is filling out this great word with a larger content than has been known heretofore, or that the Church of England has exceptional advantages and opportunities for exhibiting that content from an Anglo-Saxon standpoint. We find ourselves in the presence of certain movements, each of them fundamentally Catholic, which movements strongly coincide with aspects of the Spirit's activity which are prominent in the New Testament.

(1) The first is the quest for truth. It has often been pointed out that almost from its origin the English Church was conspicuous for its zeal for learning and knowledge.[1] Theodore's school at Canterbury; Aldhelm's educational activities in the west; Benedict Biscop and the Venerable Bede in the north; to say nothing of Andrewes and Berkeley in later days—these are enough to remind us that leaders of the Church have found in that knowledge of God which came to them through the Gospel the impetus and incentive to more knowledge and to still further discoveries of truth as they pondered on the faith which they had received. There have been times in the Church's story when men have distrusted the activities of the intellect in the supposed interest of the more direct revelations of the Spirit. It is obvious indeed that intellectual pride is one of the most alluring and devastating of all temptations. On the other hand we realise more definitely in these days that the Spirit of Truth is the fount of all wisdom through whatever avenue it may reach us. In regard to that realm of knowledge we commonly call science, we are more humble and reverent than we used to be. True science

[1] *See* Headlam, *The Church of England*, p. 27.

can never be alien to the Catholic-minded Christian, for he believes in a God who is immanent as well as transcendant, and he knows therefore that every discovery of science is in some sense a revelation—it may be in regard to the extent of the universe as in astronomy, or the methods of nature's working as in evolution, or the study of mankind as in psychology and anthropology. We know now that truth is not a tightly closed casket, but a spacious avenue along which we may advance with Christ's Spirit as guide.

And in the study of the faith we welcome all knowledge. We have the privilege to live in times when through the labours of scholarship and the discoveries of archaeology, floods of light have streamed in upon the Bible ; and we have every reason to be proud of the part which English scholars have taken in testing this light and making it available for the Church in this land. If scholars on the Continent have supplied courage in speculation and amazing powers of minute investigation, we may fairly claim that British scholars have contributed a balance of judgment which has done much to separate that which is merely speculative from established results, and has insisted that *all* the factors should be considered, including the age-long experience of the Church. There are signs that the Bible is coming once more to its own, and there is no greater or more urgent need in the Church than that its members should resume the study of it, not indeed from the point of view of our grandparents, but with all the assistance which is furnished by the solid results of scholarship to which I have alluded. In this regard the clergy have a grave responsibility. It is a subject which they have often shirked and on which no doubt some of them are insufficiently informed. But what may be called the new view of the Old Testament, that is, the rearrangement of the Books in accordance with the periods at which they were written and the investigation of the style and

circumstances of each document, so far from detracting from the inspiration of the whole, has brought home to our minds far more vividly than before the way in which 'at sundry times and in divers manners,' God spoke to those who would listen and through them made known His truth as people were able to bear it. This criticism has been beating fiercely, not merely upon the Old Testament but upon the New, and upon the origins of the Church. It is, however, not too much to say that the historic Creeds have been vindicated. The historicity of Christ (if so cold an expression may be allowed) has been more firmly established, and if, through the further elucidation of the sources of the Gospels, we no longer regard every incident as on the same level of accuracy and certainty, yet the central truths enshrined in the Catholic Faith are seen more clearly than ever to be founded on the impregnable rock of fact. Moreover, we realise that it is not merely a matter of documents or of the history of this period or that, but of the consistent experience of the multitudes in the great society who from the first day until now have found their experience of Christ to coincide with His claims; have found, in fact, that the faith which was in them works.

The Church accepts, nay rather proclaims the unity of truth. She denies that truth can ever be coloured. There is no such thing as 'Catholic truth' or 'scientific truth,' or 'Evangelical truth': truth has no party. Where men's brains could discover it it has come through the patient and persevering investigations of centuries; where man could never discover it God has intervened to teach it. The deeper is a man's apprehension of it, the more readily will he admit that he knows only 'in part,' and the more tolerant will he be of those who see it from other standpoints.

It may be said, I hope without undue boasting, that this devotion to truth is a prime characteristic

of the Church of England. That this should be recognised on all hands is a vital necessity if the Church is to maintain anything like a hold on the younger generation, for there is in the minds of the young men and women of our day a healthy craving for reality. What they cannot endure is that there should be even the smallest chink between religion and truth ; and here the responsibility of the clergy is obvious. That men engaged in that highest of all human exercises, the interpretation of God, should be open to the remotest suspicion of insincerity in their utterances, whether official or unofficial, they find intolerable. There have been cases where such a suspicion was justified. There are those whose dogmatism in the pulpit is in inverse proportion to the depth of their knowledge. There are those who confidently tilt against what they are pleased to call modernism,[1] who do not even understand the problems which are raised nor the difficulties which beset the honest seeker after truth. The comprehension and adjustment of the new light which has been coming from so many quarters calls for time and patience. Mistakes will be made : teachers will indulge in what may seem vain or even unorthodox speculations, but the spirit of truth has not deserted us, and if the Mother Church can go on producing scholars and thinkers, reverent in spirit, fearless in mind, but withal men who cannot be shaken from the bedrock of faith, there need be no undue anxiety.

Herein lies an urgent call to our Universities. They have not ceased to be places of religion : indeed it is probable that the current of spiritual life flows as strongly as ever it did, though frequently in unofficial channels as, for instance, in the Student Christian Movement. But this is not enough.

[1] I am not thinking of the ' modernism ' which rationalises the New Testament, and which practically denies the guidance of the Spirit in the life of the Church.

It is sometimes asserted that a majority of Fellows in the Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge stand apart from the Christian Church and, in many cases, from any form of religion. To these, in view of the past history of these ancient seats of learning, still more in view of the clamant needs of the present day, the Church may well address her appeal. For if, as can hardly be disputed, the continuance, not to mention the progress, of civilisation depends ultimately on religious sanctions ; if ultimately men's behaviour is determined by what they think about God, it follows that an attitude of mere intellectual detachment, if not even of silent superiority, is not merely bad for the man himself, but it is something like a crime against the rising generation. I am not thinking so much of the aggressive sceptic or the man with conscientious doubts, but rather of the man who, content to pursue the even tenor of his way, leaves religion politely on one side and whose attitude in regard to the gravest issue of life is that of a pale and bloodless neutrality. After all, from an intellectual point of view the content of the Catholic Faith is a challenge which cannot be disregarded. The ancient and piercing question, What think ye of Christ ? goes intellectually, as well as practically, to the root of things.

To those who are inclined to such a standpoint the Church may well press her challenge home. 'The whole basis of life is in question,' she may say : 'the destiny of the twentieth century, as of every age, hangs on man's power and willingness to apprehend the spiritual. Mighty questions involving the future of our race, international and otherwise, depend fundamentally on the attitude of the soul and whether the man's outlook is determined by considerations of God and His Kingdom. For God's sake come out into the open ! Do not be merely cold and critical : make up your mind as to the meaning of life and do not leave the younger ones who are coming after

without guidance and direction.' Further, in the Catholic Faith, truth is not merely a matter of speaking. It is, as St. John frequently reminds us, a matter of action. 'Doing the truth' is his characteristic phrase; and when there is a gulf between the tremendous statements of the Creed and daily behaviour in common life, the situation becomes perilous in the extreme, for it is characteristic of truth in religion that if it finds insufficient scope in character and life it becomes bedridden and ineffective. To hold and to proclaim these vital facts about God and life and eternity and not to live them is to commit a more damaging assault on the faith than the propaganda of the secularist or the atheist. The well-known words of the petition are never out of season; that 'this congregation here present . . . may hear and receive Thy holy Word'—from whatever source and through whatever avenue it comes—'truly serving Thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.'

Even now our members do not always realise their favoured position in the English Church; for we are not like Rome, committed to propositions which from the point of view of history, and judged by the standard of the early Church, are more than doubtful. We have not concentrated our attention so exclusively on doctrine and dogma as our sister the Holy Orthodox Church of the East, with whom most happily we have come into much closer relationship during these last years. Unlike some of the Free Churches we have very definite standards of faith. In a word, by our traditions, by our circumstances, and by the irresistible calls of the present time, we are constrained to that reverence for knowledge, that intellectual honesty, and that belief that the truth must ultimately prevail, which is part and parcel of our Catholic heritage.

(2) The second essential of Catholicity is fellowship. Looking at the world at large, this ideal is one which is more preached than practised. If an ultra-

emphasis on nationalism has cursed Europe since the Reformation, the process is in danger of being repeated in the East. The mere mention of the colour question, of the great racial antagonisms of our day, will guard us from too easy optimism in this respect. On the other hand, no modern movement of the Spirit has been more remarkable than this movement towards a truer and deeper fellowship both between nations and groups. It is sufficient to mention the League of Nations, the Student movement, the Scout movement, all of which are innoculating multitudes of the world's youth with the family feeling for all mankind. Only the other day, at Helsingfors, there were gathered representatives of youth from every part of the world, and, despite some anxiety at the outset, the spirit which gradually and surely pervaded the Conference was worthy of the New Testament itself. The movement, in fact, has been so rapid and so attractive that there is a danger lest it should blossom too quickly. It needs to be placed in soil where it can be firmly rooted. At present it is rather like cut flowers, beautiful but liable to fade. The only soil in which it can find a deep root and grow steadily is the soil of Christianity. In other words the movement, coming as it does manifestly from the spirit of God, must be in the minds of the peoples concerned more intelligently related to His love and His purpose. The statement may be a platitude, but it is profoundly true, that only as they acknowledge God as their Father will men acknowledge themselves as brothers. There are already fellowship movements which own no such inspiration, which, based on a narrow outlook (whether of nation or class or industrial group), tend to repudiate the very principles by which alone true fellowship can be nourished. We have here another instance of the fact that the ' other-worldly ' outlook is the most permanently productive of worldly results. For the man who learns to look at his fellows, whether of different

nations or different classes, from the point of view of God and His purpose is the most effective propagator of a fellowship which will last.

The Church's contribution to this fellowship movement is precisely to unveil and proclaim the Divine plan. It is to provide this ideal of comradeship with a passion which is unquenchable and an incentive which never fails. And this duty is the more imperative now that the ideal has been embodied, however inadequately, in the practical scheme of the League of Nations. For us of the English Church this involves a view of our world responsibilities which, to say the least, is not either very common or very popular. We have been reminded since the World Call was sounded, that we hold a strategic position both in Africa and in the East which in importance is far in excess of the mere numbers of missionaries and workers involved. This is made plain in another essay of this volume, but it is not too much to say that the prospect of our fulfilling God's purpose in this twentieth century depends on the degree in which we can rid ourselves—and here I think of Church councils and congregations even more than of clergy—of our accustomed insular outlook, and further rid ourselves of the notion that we have merely to reproduce the Church of England as nearly as possible both in books and in buildings in the countries overseas. Our business is to plant the Catholic faith and trust that, as in St. Paul's days so now, it will develop in accordance with the genius of the soil in which it is planted. Happily there are signs that this is already taking place. In India, for instance, the Church is now claiming its rightful independence. There and in Ceylon we are no longer content to build churches of third-class Victorian-Gothic, but are eager to enlist the services of Christian artists who can interpret the mind and imagination of the country to which they

belong. This means a much more lively belief that our Gospel is literally Catholic. There is still much flimsy thinking in this regard. Antediluvian-minded people can still be found who exhort us to leave the heathen to their own faiths, not realising that they have long ago been routed out of them by the impact of our so-called Western civilisation, and who half believe that the message of God is somehow primarily, if not exclusively, English.

Nor is this all. The world is in these days a small place, and gossip goes round the nations almost as quickly now as it goes round the village. Which means that if we take steps to preach the Gospel abroad we must be equally anxious to live it at home. The doings of nations in their own domestic life are no longer hidden. The industrial difficulties in England are matters of discussion in the bazaars of Calcutta and Shanghai as much as in the clubs of Berlin or the restaurants of San Francisco. It is open to any citizen of the world to ask how far we practise what we preach ; how far, in particular, we have organised our industrial life on a Christian basis. And this reflexion, to put it mildly, provokes thought.

The contrast between our present state and the confident expectations of post-war prophets is pathetic in the extreme. It is worth while boldly to prick our consciences by reading the words of ' A Student in Arms,' words which are now as completely forgotten as once they were universally regarded :

' In those days there shall be no more petty strife between class and class, for all shall have learnt that they are one nation, and that they must seek the nation's good before their own. In those days men shall no longer pride themselves on their riches, or on the material possessions which distinguish them from their brethren, for they shall have learnt that it is the qualities of the heart which are of real value.

' Men shall be prized for their courage, their honesty, their

charity, their practical ability. In those days there shall be no false pride, for all have lived hardly, all have done dirty and menial work, all have wielded pick and spade, and have counted it no dishonour but rather glory to do so. In those days charity and brotherly love shall prevail mightily, for all shall have learnt mutual understanding and respect.'[1]

By this we can measure the difference between the hopes of the dead and the achievements of the living. True, we have not been wholly neglectful. Our sense of fair play carries us some way along this road, but we are the heirs of a deep-rooted tradition that economics must always be the 'disposer supreme' of human lives; that in industry the laws of supply and demand must always have, not merely the last word, but 99 per cent. of all the words. We have only to scan the industrial history of the nineteenth century to see that every attempt to introduce other and higher considerations of humanity, fellowship and freedom, has been consistently opposed on economic grounds. Again and again the gloomy prophecies of the defenders of the *status quo* have been falsified; again and again it has been proved that those who put human considerations first do not lose their reward (though this is not a reason for doing so). This tradition is an evil legacy of the so-called industrial revolution. It does, of course, comprise much that is true. No man in his senses would suggest the defiance of the laws of supply and demand—but these laws, like other economic considerations, need to be examined in the light of higher laws and modified accordingly. It must be pointed out and, more important still, it must be believed by Church people that mere selfish ambition in industry is not a Christian motive, that co-operation is more in accordance with God's laws than naked competition, and that life is always more important than property.

[1] *The Church in the Furnace*, p. 141.

How precisely the present system can be modified is not a question which the Church is competent to decide. Her business is to keep to the forefront these higher laws; to keep persistently before men's minds the fact that to every human activity, international, industrial, social, or personal, there is a moral side; and that to ignore this is, in the long run, to court disaster. It is true that such reminders are not popular. Von Bernhardi enunciated the doctrine that where national interests are concerned morals do not apply, and thousands believe him. We smile at the famous statesman, who worked himself up into a temper about the inroads of religion. 'We are coming to a pretty pass,' he said, 'when religion aspires to invade our private lives.' Yet millions believe this of industrial life and resent the interference of religion with equal fury. This modification of our industrial system by Christian principles is a religious duty:[1] more, it is the only road to the restoration of material prosperity. The conscience of the masses is awake and is in full revolt against what is heartless and inhuman in our system. It was no doubt the hope of many after the War that, given a real will to peace on the part of both capital and labour, our present system could be continued and improved. That faith has now been rudely shaken, and shaken to its foundations.

The choice before us is plain enough. To refuse reform is to provoke a reaction even more tyrannous than the system which it supplants, and for an instance of this we have not far to look. On the other hand, modification on Christian lines calls for a capacity of thought, a courage in experiment, and a self-sacrificing perseverance which are essentially the product of Christian faith. We must get our people to believe that the means by which our men live and work is as much the concern of God as the churches in which they worship, and that such an adventure is in line

[1] See *Lambeth Conference Report*, 1920: Resolutions 74 and 75.

with all the God-inspired adventures of days gone by : Abraham told to get out of his old home and go pioneering in a land of which he knew nothing ; Moses leading the slave nation into the desert ; John the Baptist pulverising the conventions of his generation ; and the long line of Christian adventurers like the blessed Francis of Assisi, who, believing in God, have found new faith in man.

For such an adventure the nation may well look to the generation now emerging from our public schools. They, at least, have a sense of corporate life and they imbibe the tradition of 'playing the game.' Frequently indeed the tradition has been too narrow : they have failed to reproduce the corporate spirit of the school on the larger field of industrial life, and have curiously combined the sporting outlook with a strong class consciousness. None the less they are losing (as I believe) in large measure this narrowness of tradition, and indeed if they cannot produce the pioneers and adventurers required, Britain is in evil case. For the men who could have done it—and would have done it—are simply not here. There was a generation prepared for the task : it now sleeps in the fields of Flanders, of Gallipoli, and of the other great battlefields by land and sea. Broadly speaking, we have been left to face these post-war problems with a generation of older men whose main concern, naturally enough, has been to restore the pre-war system, and a generation of younger men who, not having tasted the comradeship of the trenches, have not understood the keen expectations of the men who served in the War, or the depth of their disillusionment when nothing was done. If an incentive is needed for this so vital enterprise, let them go to the War memorials in every school and ask themselves what their brothers died for and what they are doing to achieve that purpose.

As a public school man, I cannot but feel that multitudes of lads leave the familiar precincts with a deep

sense of the corporate life of the school, but with a very dim idea of the brotherhood of the nation, and even less of the brotherhood of the Church. No doubt the Church is to blame, for the majority of the men who lead the thought of the boys in these schools are her own members ; but somehow their main impression of religion seems to be that of a high ethical ideal, rather than the sharing in a great and glowing fellowship, bent on the biggest adventure ever committed to mortal man. Not that such an impression should be for one moment disparaged. The teaching of the Bible in many such schools is careful and thorough, and gives the boys a real grounding in theology. But it does not go far enough. '*C'est magnifique, mais*—quite literally—*ce n'est pas la guerre.*' It tends to a great reverence for the morality of the New Testament —and for that we may be thankful indeed—but owing to a laudable terror of unreality, it too often just stops short of the appeal which most captures the hearts of the young. It is significant in this connexion that the contribution of the public schools to full-time service in the Church—that is, the Church's ministry, whether at home or abroad—is, in comparison with the available material, infinitesimal : yet this is the type of man who pre-eminently possesses the gifts that are needed and for whom superb opportunities of Christian leadership stand ready. The quotation which I set at the head of this chapter might well be put, slightly altered, into the mouth of the public schoolboy. 'Do not offer us merely an ethical ideal ; charge us rather with Church responsibilities. Show us God as the King of all the world ; show us His Kingdom. Bid us consecrate ourselves and act and live.'

(3) When we talk of this fellowship-quality of Catholic life the retort of course is obvious and crushing, for the Church ought to be the specimen fellowship. It is not. If the Church is the Body of Christ that Body

is broken, and indeed there is a ghastly irony in the incessant repetition of this great article of the Creed. It is indeed an article of faith rather than of anything which is visible in the concrete ; yet as another essay in this volume explains, the movement towards reunion is one of the plainest tokens of the Spirit's presence in our day ; and it is remarkable that, from our Anglican point of view, the movement is in all directions, not in one. It includes Rome and the East as well as our British Christians at home. No one who cares anything for the past can do other than feel that in spite of the bitter disagreements and conflicts our ancestral home is in the Church of the West. All through those pre-Reformation years we regarded the Roman See with gratitude and reverence, even if we seldom sought or expected guidance therefrom.[1] And Bishop Creighton has reminded us that there never was a time in England when the Papal demands were not resented. The churchwardens of those days, like many of their successors, did not like money going out of the parish. Later on the breach was complete, though it was not formally made by us. With all the profound admiration which we may feel for the Roman Church, nothing is more obvious than that its grievous lack is just that Anglo-Saxon quality of Catholicism which our Church could supply. We should have much to gain from them by reunion, but we should have much to give as well. For we have held, to take only one instance, a truer conception of the Episcopal office, a deeper devotion to the standards of the New Testament. This point of view in Christianity is vital to a really Catholic Church. The Church of the West needs to be not more but less Latin in its ways, and for this reason the tendency in some circles to produce a mere imitation of Latin Catholicism is not only futile, so far as our own

[1] Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundations to the Norman Conquest*, p. 236 ff.

country is concerned, but tends to defeat the objective we have in view, which is a united Catholic Church, not only Latin, but including all those qualities and experiences which our own Church, together with others, can contribute. As to the Holy Orthodox Church of the East, we need to learn from her a deeper reverence for the great traditions of Christendom. The characteristically English ideal of broadmindedness is sometimes not far removed from shallow-mindedness ; a casualness about basal facts of faith which, if widespread, would be fatal to the Church's influence. On the other hand, we have gifts which we could give, and which I hope in the increasingly close contact, unofficial though it is, between us and the Church of the East, are giving—ways and methods of interpreting the Faith to the men of the present day and of applying it to the practical problems with which we have to deal. As for our Nonconformist brethren, they are indeed bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, for the time was when there was only one Christian Body in this land, and but for the mistakes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there might still only be one. There are elements in British Christianity which now exist in isolation, but which in combination would be irresistible. The English Church has lost much by being shorn in large measure of its Puritan elements ; Nonconformists have often by their own confession admitted the grievous lack, liturgically and otherwise, caused by detachment from the ancient Catholic Body. But there are grounds for great encouragement. The leaders have gone a long way on the road to the longed-for goal. The greatest need now is for the rank and file to think and study and pray ; to gain all the knowledge they can of brother Christians in other Communions, and then to help to create an atmosphere in which fresh steps forward may one day be taken.

When we talk of fellowship we shall be told to

look at home at the groups in the Church itself. It can hardly be denied, however, that there has been a real drawing together of the various so-called parties in the Church in recent years. Men of different standpoints, for example, are able now to work together in regard to the Missions of the Church in a way which, when I was born, would have been impossible. The Church Assembly, among its other functions, has been a splendid school in which many lessons of mutual appreciation and toleration have been learnt, and which has enabled many of the scholars to realise that our differences are mainly differences of emphasis rather than of irreconcilable fact.[1] The process has been reflected in the Parochial Church Councils in which the closer co-operation of clergy and laity is having a most salutary effect. The clergy are appreciating more keenly the lay point of view which inevitably they tend to forget or neglect ; the laity are learning a deeper sense of the meaning of their membership in the Catholic Body. In this way there is a deepening sense of the brotherhood in our Mother Church, of the responsibility which is shared by every member, as well as of the spiritual resources which belong to the whole Body, which is one of the most significant symptoms of our Church life in this twentieth century. The verdict of an observer in our army in the Great War is here profoundly true: 'It is the experience of other societies that, though they may make men value their membership by what they are, the sense of membership can only be fanned

[1] See the Chairman's statement in regard to the Commission on Doctrine: 'There was naturally a real difference of opinion on many points, but almost always this resolved itself into a difference rather of emphasis than of substance. The Commission is greatly encouraged in its hope of being able to produce a Report which will help the different schools of thought in the Church of England to realise with new depth of apprehension the reality of their oneness in faith and doctrine despite their difference of approach and emphasis, and contribute to the diminution of their differences. It asks that it may be supported in its difficult task by the prayers of the Church.'

to a passionate loyalty by what they do.' [1] Now and again, inevitably perhaps, there is a certain hardening perceptible in the relationship of the various groups. An alarm is raised, an agitation is started, often relying for its chief weapon on the arm of flesh in the shape of secular Courts and Parliaments. There are members of what is commonly called the Anglo-Catholic group whose outlook has often been distinguished more by zeal than knowledge,[2] but their opponents have seldom made any sympathetic attempt to understand the position which is criticised. For it cannot be denied that the successors of the Tractarians have brought new life to thousands in the brotherhood. Their emphasis on certain vital factors in the Faith and its practice ; the Sacraments [3] and therefore the sacramental character of all life ; the study and enrichment of worship ; the fellowship of the Church both in Paradise and on earth ; the centralness of the Incarnation with all that that involves ; the systematic pastoral ' cure of souls ' ; not least that international sense of the Church which, though sometimes exaggerated, is a needed correction of that insularity to which we are all too prone—all this has been of untold benefit to the Church at a time when inevitably old positions were being deserted and unsettlement was rife. Nor is this all. For pre-eminently they have emphasised that which is continually lost sight of, namely, that the Church is a Divine Society with its own laws and values, and that the attempt to identify it with the nation or to confound its standards with those of the world is as futile as it is un-Scriptural and un-Catholic. We have, I believe, in the Church, a quite unparalleled opportunity for

[1] *The Church in the Furnace*, p. 163.

[2] That this is exceptional and not characteristic of the movement is sufficiently indicated by the volume, ' Essays Catholic and Critical,' which has attracted so much attention of late.

[3] But there has not been sufficient emphasis on the meaning and implication of Baptism.

growing a Catholicism which, rooted in the past, shall be alive and adequate to the needs of the present, and this group can, if they will, lead us in this direction. But they must realise that the opportunity will be lost if our people have any excuse for identifying their hopes and aspirations with a merely mediaeval and obscurantist attitude, whether in doctrine or worship. In a few of the more ardent spirits in the group there would seem to be a desire to establish a kind of Italian absolutism, not to say a clerical professionalism, which is not only alien to the English character but gives a false impression of the real genius of the movement. We have been told from all sides, both in America and in this country, by those who have no bias towards Catholicism, that Protestantism—in the popular sense of that word—is dead. In so far as this is true, it means an opportunity for the English Catholic Church which has simply not occurred since the Reformation. If our Church can realise the grandeur of this vocation she may yet be able to lead the English people to a Christianity at once historic in its foundations, yet modern in its outlook ; which, with its open Bible and its open Altar, might mean a fuller and deeper Christianity than we have known. *To this end all the groups must co-operate.* For only through the salutary discipline which this involves can we attain the corporate capacity for so great a task. The fact is we must be patient, tolerant, sympathetic ; we have simply not had time to digest and, where advisable, to assimilate the elements which have come to the fore in recent years. I have already referred to the new view of the Bible ; to the new perspective in which we see the problems and possibilities of Reunion ; to the new emphasis on truths from whose exaggerations we naturally and rightly reacted at the Reformation ; to the new explorations, with the aid of art and psychology, into the mysteries of worship. The enrichment of our Prayer Book is one phase of this great

opportunity. If the groups within the Church can brace themselves to a more deliberate belief in the Holy Ghost and a more complete reliance on His guidance, mighty things may happen.

III

Not many words need be said about the third note of the Church—Apostolic. Its primary meaning here is sufficiently described for our own Church in the Preface to the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer. Whatever precise theories may be attached to the 'Apostolic Succession,' the fact remains that the Fathers-in-God, and therefore their families, join hands across the centuries. The generations may come and go, but the family is one and continuous. But there is more in the phrase than this. For us at least in our Mother Church, as for others, it is a reminder of the norm of our Church life; of the trust of the Faith committed to us; and of the world-wide commission which we hold. Look again more closely at this last. No more lofty enterprise can be conceived than the one for which—in common with the whole Church—we are responsible. To spread the Kingdom of God throughout the nations, that is one aspect of it; to capture for that Kingdom every department of life, that is another aspect not less vital. As members of the Catholic Society we have therefore one common end in view, an end which ought to be so intelligible to the members, so obviously urgent, that it compels each group to magnify, not its own position, but the greatness of the objective to which we are all committed. Many a man among us, worthily enthusiastic for his own school of thought, might well take to heart the late Lord Salisbury's advice to a soldier nervous in regard to some supposed danger on the Indian frontier: 'Look at a large-scale map.' To adapt words used in another connexion: 'We have an aim and ob-

ject so universal that the platelayer may say to the barrister or the teacher, or the soldier may say to the miner or the merchant, or the Indian to the Englishman, or the Evangelical to the Anglo-Catholic, What are we doing for it?' As in war time all groups in the nation closed their ranks, so it must be in the Church in these days; not minimising their differences but seeing them in the light of the great adventure. For if our aim is Apostolic, so must our methods be, and this means, first and foremost, sacrifice. The lack of this in the nation has been our undoing since the War.[1] It is true that sacrifice is difficult when merely political or economic incentives are available, but we have no such excuse. For fronting us is the exhibition in time and space of that which is inherent in God Himself. Every day, if our religion means anything, 'We survey the wondrous Cross on which the Prince of Glory died.' The measure of our willingness to follow Him is the measure of our Apostolic Succession. More than this, nothing flames forth more brightly from the pages of the Acts of the Apostles than the sense of the presidency of the Spirit, and the way in which our spiritual ancestors resorted to prayer,-not merely in every emergency but at every step. The people responded to an Apostolic leadership which, in its turn, was wholly and daily dependent on the motions of the Spirit. They will do so still if it is there. To the clergy, as to the bishops, there are offered in these days opportunities of leadership whose potency can hardly be exaggerated. In the twentieth

[1] 'How shallow was our conception of Reconstruction!—was every conception of Reconstruction I ever encountered! To most of the hopeful people of that time Reconstruction meant simply—all they wanted—at once. Labour, for example, demanded an immediate shortening of hours and a rise in wages, and was blind to any necessity for intermediate phases or auxiliary constructive effort. In England, trade after trade struck vigorously and got its advances, its eight-hour day, and crowded off at once to see the cinema and football matches, leaving the working-out of the Millennium to anyone else who chose to bother. Nobody chose to bother.' H. G. Wells, *The World of William Clissold*, vol. ii. p. 334.

ALTHORP LIBRARY

century as in the first the need of the world and the love of God seek a meeting-place in persons consecrated and Spirit-filled who shall sympathise with the one and unveil the other. Every year almost we are told that there is a crisis in the Church. In the literal and proper sense of that word it is true to-day. There is a Judgment, and Judgment is beginning at the House of God. Like some of the men who were very near Christ in the days of His flesh and who talked much of His Kingdom, we have to look Him in the face and listen to His question, 'Are ye able to drink of the cup which I drink of and to be baptised with the baptism wherewith I am baptised?'

On the answer to that searching question will depend the future of the Church of England.

Printed in Great Britain at The Ballantyne Press *by*
Spottiswoode, Ballantyne & Co. Ltd.
Colchester, London & Eton.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

81164 283.004S M331
Marchant, J.
AUTHOR
The future of the Church of Eng.
TITLE
283.004S
M331
81164